DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 432 083 EC 307 288

AUTHOR	Idol, Lorna; Griffith, Julia
TITLE	A Study of Four Schools: Moving toward Inclusion of Special Education Students in General Education.
INSTITUTION	Austin Independent School District, TX. Office of Program Evaluation.
PUB DATE	1998-12-00
NOTE	83p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Role; Attitudes toward Disabilities; *Disabilities; Elementary Education; *Incidence; *Inclusive Schools; Interviews; Mainstreaming; *Principals; School Administration; *Student Placement; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	Austin Independent School District TX

ABSTRACT

This report discusses the outcomes of a study that examined how special education services were being provided in four elementary schools in the Austin Independent School District in the 1997-98 school year: Brentwood, Dawson, Pillow, and Zavala. The study's intention was to determine how much, if any, inclusion of students with disabilities in general education classes was occurring. Principals, assistant principals, special and general education teachers, and teacher assistants were interviewed at the four schools, resulting in 125 interviews. The number and type of student with disabilities on each campus varied considerably and the number of students with a disability seemed to be related to how far advanced each school was with its plans for inclusion. The school with the fewest number of students with disabilities made the most advances with inclusion. In general, the administrators in these four schools were found to be doing a good job of working with and supporting the teachers, as evidenced by the teachers' perceptions of them. Many teachers viewed their principals as being supportive of them and as being instructional leaders. The majority had very positive attitudes toward including students with disabilities in general education programs. Appendices include assessment materials. (Contains 29 references.) (CR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 432 083

A Study of Four Schools: Moving Toward Inclusion of Special Education Students in General Education

EC 307288

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Austin Independent School District
Office of Program Evaluation
December 1998

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Heuring
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

A Study of Four Schools: Moving Toward Inclusion of Special Education Students in General Education:

Executive Summary

Austin Independent School District
Office of Program Evaluation

Authors: Lorna Idol, Ph.D
Julia Griffith

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine and describe how special education services were being provided in four elementary schools in the Austin Independent School District in the 1997-98 school year: Brentwood, Dawson, Pillow, and Zavala. One specific intent was to determine how much, if any, inclusion of students with disabilities in general education classes was occurring. Another intent was to understand better how each school provided for students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment (as mandated in PL 94-142, Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975).

Inclusion is when students with disabilities receive all of their academic program in the general education program. This is different than mainstreaming, which is when a student with disabilities spends a portion of their school day in the general education program and a portion in a separate special education program (Idol, 1997). Both inclusion and mainstreaming are ways to educate students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment.

Rationale

The rationale for this study was to measure and describe what happens in schools as educators move toward more inclusive educational practices. For example, there are several indicators of success with inclusion that are important to examine when trying to understand what happens with a school faculty as they move toward creating inclusive school programs. These indicators are reflected in the questions that were asked of the staff in each of these four elementary schools and covered these areas:

- The types of disabilities of the students in special education attending the school;
- the amount of time students in special education actually spend learning in the general education program;
- the number and types of support personnel available and how these personnel are used;
- the number and types of referrals for special education testing;
- the attitudes of all staff toward each other, toward students with special education needs, and toward inclusion;
- staff perceptions of their skills in making both instructional and curricular modifications, as well as in student discipline and classroom management;
- staff perceptions of the impact on inclusion on other students; and
- the perceptions of parents about students with disabilities, inclusion, and the impact on their own children.

Two types of data were gathered in this study: questionnaire and interview data from educators at each campus. It was thought to be important to measure perceptions of all instructional staff, rather than a random sample or only the leaders or the most outspoken on a campus. Thus, in each of the four schools, an effort was made to interview as many educators as possible in the two-day window allocated for gathering data at each campus.

Data Collection

The evaluator visited each of the four schools for the equivalent of two days at each campus and interviewed principals, assistant principals, classroom teachers, special education teachers, special area teachers (counselors, speech/language pathologists, computer lab teachers, physical education teachers, music teachers, art teachers), and teacher assistants, resulting in 125 interviews. There were five administrators and four teacher assistants (one at each school) interviewed. Also interviewed were 79 classrooms teachers (75% of total across schools), 24 special education teachers (92% of total across schools), and 13 support staff (50% across schools). [Detailed descriptions of these schools and the types of resources each had can be found in the full report.]

Major Findings

Incidence and Types of Disabilities

The number and types of students with disabilities on each campus varied considerably.

- Dawson had the most students with disabilities, the largest number of special education programs where students were pulled out of the general classroom for services, and many more students with speech impairments.
- Brentwood had all of the students with auditory impairments and the second largest number of students with disabilities.
- Pillow had fewer students with disabilities than Dawson and Brentwood but had more students with multiple and more severe disabilities conditions than did Zavala.
- Students at Zavala were pulled out of the classroom only for speech and language intervention.
- Brentwood and Pillow had more students with emotional disturbances.
- Only Dawson had students with multiple and/or orthopedic disabilities.
- Pillow had many more students with other health impairments.
- Across schools approximately one-third of the students across schools were identified as having learning disabilities.
- Across all four schools, there were more students with emotional disturbances and other health impairments than there were students with mental retardation.

Overall, the number of students with a disability seems to be related to how far along each school is with inclusion. For example, Zavala has made the most advances with inclusion and they had the fewest number of students with disabilities. However, nearly all of the students at Zavala were reported as being at risk for school failure.

Time Spent in General Education

- Zavala was also the only school that included all of the students with disabilities in the general education program 100% of the time.

- There were only three students (one at Brentwood and two at Dawson) who were included 100% of the time.

- No students at Pillow were included 100% of the time, but 14 were included 90% of the time. At each of the schools where inclusion was not practiced, there were students with disabilities spending from 75-99% of their time in general education classes (38% at Brentwood; 36% at Pillow; but only 15% at Dawson).

- In contrast, there were large numbers of students at Brentwood, Dawson, and Pillow who spent either no time or less than 25% of their time with general education students (60% at Brentwood; 59% at Dawson; 34% at Pillow).

Roles of the Special Education Teachers

In total, 24 special education teachers were interviewed. They all fulfilled the job they were assigned to do. For example, if they were assigned to a self-contained unit, they served as a self-contained teacher, or to a resource program as a resource teacher, and so on. Yet, some of them managed to spend time with classroom teachers helping students with disabilities succeed in the general education program as well.

- Eight of them spent a portion of their time as consulting teachers to classroom teachers, planning together to implement programs for students with disabilities in the general education program.

- Nine of them spent some time as cooperative teachers, teaching students with disabilities in the general education classes with the classroom teachers.

Referrals for Special Education Testing

- The proportion of students referred for academic problems is remarkably similar across schools, ranging from 2-3% of the total school population.

- There were few referrals for behavioral problems.

Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Inclusion

Three principals (Dawson, Pillow and Zavala) and two assistant principals (Dawson and Brentwood) were interviewed. [The principal at Brentwood was on medical leave, and the assistant principal was the acting principal.]

- All of the administrators reported they were very much in favor of inclusion.

- All of them also said their attitudes toward students with disabilities were very supportive.

- None of the administrators were in favor of inclusion without extra support to the classroom teacher.

- All of the administrators said they were good collaborators and worked well with the teachers.

When asked how they thought students with disabilities were best educated:

- Three of them said their first choice was for the students to attend grade level classes with a special educator or assistant. Another administrator chose this option as a strong second choice.

- Two administrators' first choice was to educate students with disabilities in grade level classes with supportive resource services. [Supportive resource services meant that the classroom and the resource teacher planned together so that the resource curriculum corresponded to the classroom curriculum.]

- Only one administrator chose to mainstream students with disabilities only part time, and this was a second choice.

- All of the administrators thought inclusion would be best implemented if extra adults were provided to work with any student needing assistance, not just with students in need of special education.

Attitudes of Faculty Toward Principal

In the past decade, principals and their leadership styles have gradually changed from principals serving exclusively as administrative managers to combining management with the role of instructional leaders. [Instructional leadership means the principal is actively involved with teachers in making curricular decisions and spending time in classrooms as a leader in shaping the development of programs.] All 120 educators interviewed were asked which of these two roles best described their principal.

- On every campus there were mixed responses: the majority at the first school (79%) and the second school (56%), and to a lesser degree, at the third school viewed their principal as being both an instructional leader and an administrative leader.

- At the fourth school, 28% thought the principal filled both roles, but the majority (59%) thought of the principal as an administrative manager.

- Educators at, Pillow (96%) and Zavala (94%) viewed the principal as being "very supportive of inclusion."

- At Brentwood, 76% of the faculty gave this rating, but only 30% of the faculty at Dawson rated their principal as being very supportive of inclusion. [At Dawson, however, 37% did not rate the principal because this was her first year at Dawson and they were not certain as to her stance.]

These educators also tended to rate their principals high on being *supportive* of them as professionals. Across schools, the majority said their principals were *very supportive* of them. Very few individuals said otherwise.

Educators' Skills in Accommodating Students with Challenging Needs

Teachers and teacher assistants were asked to rate themselves in three skill areas related to effective inclusion of students with disabilities: 1) adaptation of instruction, 2) modification of curriculum, and 3) student discipline and classroom management. Generally, educators in all four schools reported that they were *applying the skills* in each of the three skill areas.

- At Brentwood, 42% of the teachers rated themselves as being *very skilled* at making adaptations for students with disabilities. These teachers rated themselves higher on adapting instruction for students with disabilities than for students who were at risk of school failure.

- At Dawson and Pillow the second most frequently occurring response was viewing themselves as being very skilled with both types of students.

- At Zavala the teachers in this school are more involved with inclusion than in the other schools; yet, 21% reported they needed more practice with students with disabilities and 24% with students who are at risk for school failure.

The Zavala responses are interesting because these educators may have a clearer perception of what is needed for successful inclusion, as they are doing more of it.

Educators' Attitudes Toward Students with Disabilities

- Attitudes toward inclusion tended to range between staff being willing to accept and to try inclusion and to being very much in favor of inclusion.

- Attitudes toward students with disabilities were positive and indicated that most educators across schools were supportive of these students.
- In all four schools, nearly all educators thought of themselves as being either collaborative or willing to work with other teachers.
- Across all four schools only two individuals thought students with disabilities should be taught in self-contained special education classes.
- No educators thought students with disabilities should be taught on separate special education campuses.
- At Brentwood, most educators favored teaching students with disabilities in grade level classes with either a special educator (teacher or teacher assistant) with them (33%) or with supportive resource services (33%).
- At Dawson, most favored either grade level classes with the special educator in the class (33%) or mainstreamed classes with part-time special education (30%).
- At Pillow, the preferred choice was grade level classes with the special educator present (30%), although supportive resource services (22%) and mainstreamed classes with part-time special education classes (22%) were also common choices.
- Even though inclusion is practiced at Zavala, the majority also thought the special education teacher or teacher assistant should accompany the students (58%).
- A few educators thought students with disabilities could be in the general education classes without the special educator or assistant accompanying them.

The responses to the question how to teach students with disabilities most effectively if they were attending general education classes were compelling. In every school, nearly all of the educators thought the best choice was to include students with disabilities with general education students and have available adults work with any student needing assistance.

The Impact of Inclusion on Other Students

Across the four schools, the respondents reported that the other students in the classroom remained unaffected by the presence of students with disabilities in the class.

- The majority (68%), across the four schools, thought the others students were improved (36%) or about the same (32%) across the six variables.
- Overall, the impact of including students with disabilities in the classroom was not thought to be harmful to other students.
- Only 6%, across schools, responded that the other students were adversely affected by the presence of the students with disabilities in the general education classes.
- Eleven percent or fewer of the respondents at each campus thought other students were worse across the following five variables: student academic skills, grades, students' attitudes toward students with disabilities, students' attitudes toward inclusion, and parental attitudes toward inclusion.
- Overall, 36% respondents reported having students with disabilities in general education classes resulted in an increase in TAAS scores of general education students; and 33% reported that TAAS scores of general education students remained the same.
- In two of the four schools (Brentwood and Pillow), educators reported student attitudes toward students with disabilities had improved as a result of inclusion.
- At Zavala, attitudes toward disabilities remained about the same as a result of inclusion.
- Only at Dawson did teachers report that other students in general education exhibited improved social behaviors.
- In the other three schools, social behaviors of other students remained about the same.

Averaged TAAS Scores for Four Schools

TAAS student performance data were gathered through the AISD PEIMS/Systemwide Testing Office for all students in the four schools.

- The most striking finding was that with one exception, each school made noticeable improvement in averaged student TAAS scores over a period of four years (1993-94 to 1997-98).
- The only exception was at Zavala,where third graders' average scores remained about the same (60% in 1993-4 and 57% in 1997-98).

In each of these schools efforts have been made to include students with disabilities for portions of the school day (mainstreaming) and to include (100%) some of them in general education classes. These data provide evidence that the presence of students with disabilities in the general education program has not been deleterious to the test performance of the general education students. This finding is further substantiated by the general impressions of the teachers interviewed, as well.

Exemptions of Special Education Students from TAAS Testing

There was variation in how testing of students with disabilities was handled at each of these four schools.

- Brentwood tested about the same number of students with disabilities over the four years (15% and 16% respectively).
- Dawson exempted 51% in 1993-94 and reduced this number to 32% in 1997-98.
- Pillow had a reverse trend; in 1993-94 17% of the students were exempted and in 1997-98, 34% were exempted. [Also, during this same time period, more self-contained special education classes were added at Pillow.]
- There was a slight decrease in exempted students at Zavala; 67% in 1993-94 and 60% in 1997-98.
- The highest percentage of students with disabilities exempted from TAAS testing was at Zavala, which is also the only school where all students with disabilities were included 100% of the time.

Of the students with disabilities taking the TAAS, only a small number met the requirements for minimal test mastery, but a few students did pass the test.

Qualitative Responses of Educators Toward Inclusion

Many of these educators had additional ideas to share about inclusion and the education of students with special education needs. Their comments were generally positive and reflect acceptance of students with disabilities. Several indicated that they:

- liked having teacher assistants.
- valued the special education teachers and speech pathologists.
- were proud of their programs.
- attitudes toward students with disabilities felt the TAAS scores of general education students were not affected.
- did not like pull-out programs.
- liked inclusion.

Several also recommended certain practices and policies be implemented such as:

- offering more staff development on inclusion.
- offering opportunities to visit schools farther along with inclusion.
- respecting the special challenges presented to the classroom teacher and providing support.
- making the special education assessment process more relative to classroom applications.
- providing better training for teacher assistants.
- catching reading problems earlier.
- using mainstreaming rather than inclusion with students with more serious emotional problems.

Qualitative Responses of Parents Toward Inclusion

The selection of parents to respond to the parent questionnaire was not systematic. Therefore, no quantitative data were compiled. However, it is instructive to examine the qualitative responses of these parents [detailed in the full report]. Their attitudes were mixed, but generally positive. A rank ordering of schools by percentage of positive comments about educating students with disabilities in general education resulted in the following: Brentwood (67%), Pillow (56%), Zavala (47%), and Dawson (33%).

Recommendations

Detailed and explanatory recommendations can be found in the full report that center around the following topics:

- All staff should be guided in the exploration of additional service delivery options, such as consulting teaching and the use of teacher assistance teams, rather than relying solely on resource services or cooperative teaching.
- Reconsider the viability of self-contained classes as only 2 of 120 educators favored self-contained classes as their first choice for optimal special education service delivery.
- Consider mainstreaming instead of inclusion for certain students with serious behavior and emotional problems.
- Consider reassigning all students with disabilities to their neighborhood schools for more equitable distribution of types of disabilities across campuses.

Staff Development

These educators indicated that more staff development related to inclusion is needed in these areas:

- making appropriate instructional and curricular modifications.
- supporting teachers of inclusive classrooms in a variety of ways, including: consulting teaching, teacher assistants, cooperative teaching, and teacher assistance teams.
- providing more staff development to teacher assistants.
- visiting schools where inclusion is practiced.
- using the same sound disciplinary practices regardless of whether the student is a student with disabilities or one who is at risk for school failure.
- using cooperative, heterogeneous learning groups.
- using reading tutor programs. [The reading tutorial program in the library at Zavala is an example of this.]

Policies and Practices

As teachers move toward more inclusive classrooms, they often discover that many of the same strategies that work with students who are at risk for school failure also work for certain students with disabilities, and vice versa. This practice was evident in several classrooms across the four schools. As schools move in this direction, it is important to monitor how many other students in a classroom are benefiting from strategies the special education consulting teacher and the classroom teacher developed for a student with disabilities.

Over time, some students may be able to master the TAAS and this practice could result in teachers' having higher expectations for certain students with disabilities.

- At the local level, examine TAAS data for students with disabilities and report separately from the general education students.
- Give more of the students with disabilities the opportunity to prepare for and take the TAAS.

Some final recommendations regarding policies and practices are:

- monitor the referrals to special education.
- examine how speech/language services are offered. Some of this instruction, particularly language intervention, could be offered in the general education program with the speech/language pathologist serving as a consulting teacher.
- make decisions to include a student with disabilities in general education on a child-by-child basis, as it is done at Pillow.

For schools that are farther along with inclusion, the total inclusion approach, as exemplified at Zavala, would be a good model to follow.

Summary

In general, the administrators in these four schools are doing a good job of working with and supporting the teachers, as evidenced by the teachers' perception of them. For many schools, teachers' perceptions of lack of principal support is the primary reason why change, and in particular movement to inclusion, does not take place. In these four schools, many teachers viewed their principal as being supportive of them and as being an instructional leader. The majority had very positive attitudes toward including students with disabilities in general education programs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents v
List of Tables vi
PART I: LITERATURE REVIEW 1
The History of Public Law 94-142 3
The Right to Inclusive Education 4
Funding 4
Research Conducted During the 1970s and 1980s 5
Research on the Social Benefits of Mainstreaming 5
Research on the Academic Benefits of Mainstreaming 7
Research Conducted During the 1990s 7
Research on the Social Benefits of Inclusion 8
Research on the Academic Benefits of Inclusion 9
Conclusion 10
PART II: STUDY OF FOUR SCHOOLS 13
Introduction 15
Rationale 15
Procedures 16
Selection of Schools 16
Data Collection 16
Results 18
Descriptions of Four Schools 18
Discussion and Recommendations 36
Appendices 41
Appendix A 43
Appendix B 47
Appendix C 51
Appendix D 55
Appendix E 59
Appendix F 61
Appendix G 67
Appendix H 76
Reference List 79

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Campus Characteristics of Four Elementary Schools, 1997-98 17
Table 2: Number and Percentage of Types of Primary Disabilities of Students with Disabilities at Four Schools 23
Table 3: Number and Percentage of Students with Disabilities by Time Taught in General Education Classes At Four Schools 24
Table 4: Summary Data on Referrals to Special Education 25
Table 5: Percentage of Faculty Perceptions of Principal Leadership Style 27
Table 6: Frequency and Percentage Responses of Educators' Perceptions of Skills in Accommodating Special Education and At-Risk Students in the Classroom 27
Table 7.1 Educators' Averaged Attitudes Toward Teaching Students with Disabilities in the Classroom 28
Table 7.2: Frequency of Educators' Choices for How and Where to Best Teach Students with Disabilities 30
Table 8.1: Reported Impact on Other Students as a Result of Educating Students with Disabilities in the Classroom Across Four Schools 31
Table 8.2: Summary of Educators' Attitudes Regarding Impact of Inclusion on General Education Students 33
Table 9: Number of General and Students with Disabilities at Four Schools with Percentages of Students with Disabilities Exempted from TAAS 35
Table 10.1: TAAS Data for Brentwood Elementary School Students, 1993-94 and 1997-98 76
Table 10.2: TAAS Data for Dawson Elementary School Students, 1993-94 and 1997-98 76
Table 10.3: TAAS Data for Pillow Elementary School Students, 1993-94 and 1997-98 77
Table 10.4: TAAS Data for Zavala Elementary School Students, 1993-94 and 1997-98 77

PART I: LITERATURE REVIEW

THE HISTORY OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142

In 1975, President Gerald Ford signed into law PL 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act. This law "provided free, appropriate public education for all handicapped children regardless of severity of handicap, protected the rights of handicapped children and parents in educational decision making, required that an individualized education program be developed for each handicapped child, and required that handicapped students receive educational services in the least restrictive environment" (Office of Special Education, History of Special Education). Also included was a Preschool Incentive Grant program that funded special education services for eligible children aged 3 to 5 years old.

In 1990, the law was renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (PL 101-476). Autism and traumatic brain injury were included as eligible disabilities, and IDEA focused on the individual, providing rehabilitation counseling and preparing students for life after special education (Office of Special Education, History of Special Education).

In 1997, the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) was re-authorized. The new law states that the Individualized Education Programs (IEP), which are planned for each child in special education, must be more clearly aligned with those of children in general classrooms and include regular education teachers in the decision-making process. The new law also requires districts to include students served by special education in state and district assessments, and in setting and reporting performance goals. Progress reports are required to be sent to parents along with periodic re-evaluations of their children's programs, and parents are now included in eligibility and placement decisions about their child with disabilities. New laws have removed the financial incentives for placing students in separate settings by allowing funds to be used for services to children with disabilities in regular classroom settings, even if children without disabilities benefit as well. In addition, schools are required to address the language needs of limited English proficient students, and must gather data to verify that these children are not being disproportionately identified and placed in separate educational settings. Teachers will be provided with training to meet the special needs of these children (Office of Special Education, History of Special Education).

As required by the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, eligibility for special education services must be determined by a State or local education agency or other State agency. With parental consent, this agency must conduct an individual evaluation using assessment tools which are culturally unbiased, administered in the child's native language, and which gather relevant functional and developmental information, including information provided by the parent. A child will be recognized as a child with disabilities if diagnosed with mental retardation, hearing impairments (including deafness), speech or language impairments, visual impairments (including blindness), serious emotional disturbance, orthopedic impairments, autism, traumatic brain injury, other health impairments, or specific learning disabilities (IDEA Amendments of 1997). A reevaluation must be conducted at least once every three years, or more frequently if requested by the child's parents or teacher.

Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) does not by itself qualify a student for special education and research has suggested that the use of medication, such as the stimulant

Ritalin, is successful in the temporary management of ADHD symptoms while in the general classroom. However, the use of stimulants has not been shown to produce significant improvement in reading skills, social skills, or learning and achievement (Hocutt, 1996).

THE RIGHT TO INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

Educating students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment (LRE), as originally mandated in PL 94-142, has led to a growing debate over the benefits of educating students in the regular classroom. LRE states that students with disabilities must be educated with students who do not have disabilities, unless their disability is so severe that satisfactory education cannot take place, even with supplementary aids and services. Schools must also justify removing a student with disabilities from the regular education classroom. Inclusion differs from the "mainstreaming" efforts of the past in that inclusion places students with special education needs in an age-appropriate general education classroom *100% of the school day* (Idol, 1997). Mainstreaming refers to placing a student with special education needs into the general classroom *as much as possible*; however, the student is still educated partially in a special education program (Idol, 1997). Perhaps more clearly stated, inclusion is at one end of the mainstreaming continuum with special centers at the other.

Parents of some students with disabilities have feared that inclusion in a regular classroom will result in "dumping" their children into an environment where they cannot succeed. In addition, parents often believe that their children will no longer be eligible for special education support and services (Illinois Coalition on School Inclusion, 1994). However, by law, inclusion must include supplemental services in conjunction with regular class placement. Several court cases have supported the student's right to inclusion. In Daniel R.R. v. State Board of Education, the Fifth Circuit Court determined that the state must take steps to accommodate the child with disabilities in regular education. The state must also determine whether the child will benefit from the modified general education program, and what effect the presence of a child with a disability has on other children (National Study on Inclusive Education, 1994). In Greer v. Rome City School, the 11th Circuit Court ruled that a district may consider the cost of educating a child with disabilities in a regular classroom, but that costs would have to "significantly impact upon the other children in the district" to deny the child placement (National Study on Inclusive Education, 1994). Similarly, in Oberti v. Board of Education of the Borough of Clementon School District, the 3rd Circuit Court emphasized that the burden of proving a child should not be in a regular classroom is on the school district, citing that special education techniques can be used by a properly trained regular classroom teacher (National Study on Inclusive Education, 1994).

FUNDING

In addition to parental and educational support, providing education to students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment requires fiscal support as well. Fiscal policies can affect the implementation of inclusive or more integrated programs. For example, proponents of inclusion argue that, by serving students with disabilities in their home schools, districts can reduce transportation costs and redirect funds to provide the additional special education

supports needed in the regular classroom. However, in many state funding systems, money saved through reduced transportation costs cannot be transferred for use in other areas. As districts move students with disabilities to their neighborhood schools, these funds could provide the necessary equipment to make schools accessible to all students (Parrish, 1995).

Similarly, funding which is available to state schools to serve students with disabilities is not always available to local districts should they choose to serve the same students. In interviews conducted by Parrish (1995), directors of special education stated that more flexibility in the use of special education resources would be an important motivation for change. The National Study on Inclusive Education (1994) reported that some districts have reluctantly identified students in need of special education services simply to gain the funding necessary to provide a quality program.

RESEARCH CONDUCTED DURING THE 1970S AND 1980S

Research conducted during the 1970s and 1980s focused on the impact of mainstreaming. Mainstreamed students with special needs are educated in the general education classroom as much as possible, with some education still taking place in a special education program. However, research comparing mainstreaming resource programs to general classroom instruction on academic performance produced mixed results. A review of research conducted during this time produced outcomes in favor of resource programs, outcomes in favor of general classroom programs, and outcomes showing no difference in academic performance between programs (Idoi, 1993). Similarly, research studies in which a variety of programs were compared for personal and social adjustment of students also produced mixed results (Idol, 1993).

RESEARCH ON THE SOCIAL BENEFITS OF MAINSTREAMING

Students with disabilities have been shown to be deficient in social skills, and proponents of mainstreaming have cited the potential for increased social skills in support of mainstreaming (Gresham, 1983). However, when Gresham (1982) reviewed 40 studies on the social skills of mainstreamed students with disabilities, he found that mainstreamed students with disabilities neither interacted more frequently nor more positively with their regular education peers. Mainstreamed students with disabilities were poorly accepted by their regular education peers, and students with disabilities did not model the behavior of their regular education peers as a result of the increased exposure to them. Furthermore, many students with disabilities do not have the imitative, attending, memory, or motor-reproductive skills which are necessary to benefit from regular classroom placement (Gresham, 1982). Based on these findings, Gresham believed that placement decisions for students with disabilities should be based more on their social skill level, as determined by a multidisciplinary team, than on IQ and academic achievement, which is most often used.

However, a research review conducted by Madden and Slavin (1983) found regular class placement to be more socially beneficial than special class placement (Meyerowitz, 1962, Calhoun & Elliott, 1977, Carroll, 1967, Gampel, et. al., 1974 and 1975, Budoff & Gottlieb, 1976). Students who participated in regular classes for all or part of the day identified with fewer derogatory statements about themselves, presenting a more positive self-concept than their peers educated in a special program. Other researchers found that special class students

displayed greater verbal flexibility, fluency, and took a more "success approaching approach" than regular class students (Cassidy & Stanton, 1959, Goldstein, 1965, as cited in Madden & Slavin, 1983).

Beckman and Kohl (1987) compared the interactions of preschoolers with and without disabilities in both integrated and segregated settings throughout the school year. The results of their study showed a steady increase in positive social interaction for children without disabilities in both settings and increases in positive social interaction for children with disabilities in the integrated setting. Campbell, Dobson, and Bost (1985) studied educator perceptions of behavior problems among mainstreamed students. They found that educators were less likely to view a behavior problem as serious for students with a mental disability than for students without disabilities or students with a physical disability. These educators were also more likely to recommend authoritarian types of treatment for the behavior problems of students without disabilities compared to students with disabilities.

Parents of students with disabilities placed in regular education classrooms often fear that their children will be verbally or physically abused, resented, or otherwise mistreated by their peers without disabilities. Parents are also concerned that their children will be isolated from other peers with disabilities, yet foster few friendships with their regular education classmates (McDonnell, 1987). However, McDonnell (1987) found that the majority of parents whose children attended integrated programs reported few incidents of mistreatment, isolation, or loss of service. Only 20% of parents whose children had previously attended special schools reported a loss of speech, language, physical therapy, and occupational services when their children were educated in the regular classroom. However, in theory, reduction of services should not be an issue when students are moved to the regular classroom. As stated earlier, Public Law 94-142 mandates that inclusive classrooms provide adequate supplemental services to students educated in the regular classroom.

In a study of service delivery preferences of students, Jenkins and Heinen (1989) found that student preference differed by grade level and by current placement. Older remedial, special education, and regular education students were more likely to prefer pull-out services, viewing help from a specialist in the classroom as embarrassing. Also, remedial students and students served by special education currently receiving pull-out services preferred pull-out services, students receiving in-class services preferred each service equally, while those students in integrated classrooms had a tendency to prefer in-class help. Overall, students stated that they would prefer to receive special instruction, whether in-class or pull-out, from their regular classroom teacher, believing that their classroom teacher knows better what they need.

Overall, the data reviewed do not give a clear indication of the benefits of mainstreaming. It does not appear that mainstreaming necessarily improves the social standing of students with disabilities with their regular education peers. However, some studies have shown that mainstreaming improves the way students with disabilities feel about themselves, perhaps an equally important benefit. It also appears that students with disabilities prefer not to change the way in which they currently receive services, perhaps in an effort not to draw attention to their special needs. Similarly, older students prefer to receive help out of the classroom, so as to be singled out as little as possible.

RESEARCH ON THE ACADEMIC BENEFITS OF MAINSTREAMING

Madden and Slavin (1983) reviewed the following research on the academic and social outcomes of mainstreamed students with mild disabilities, and found no evidence to support the academic benefits of special class placement. When students with educable mental retardation (EMR) and students with emotional disturbance (ED) were randomly assigned to full-time special education classes or regular classes, regular classes were found to have a more positive effect on the achievement of students identified as EMR or ED (Calhoun & Elliott, 1977). *The regular class was designed to meet the needs of students with mild academic disabilities, utilizing a primarily individualized curriculum by special education teachers.* Leinhardt (1980) compared an individualized reading system in a special education class, a mainstreamed class, and a mainstreamed class which used a basal reading program. Low achieving students in the regular class which used the individualized reading system made significantly greater gains in reading achievement. Similarly, Wang (1982) found that students with disabilities who participated in a reading program in a regular class which used published individualized materials improved over those receiving reading instruction in special classes. However, Myers (1976) found that low IQ students in a special school setting achieved more in reading and spelling than low IQ students in a special class in a regular school or in a regular education classroom. *The special class in the special school setting practiced greater individualization and behavior modification procedures than the other two classes.* Higher IQ students participating in this study achieved significantly more in reading in the regular class. In fact, both Goldstein, et al. (1965) and Myers (1976) (as cited in Madden & Slavin, 1983) found some evidence that higher IQ students (above 70) benefit from regular class placement with minimal support.

Research comparing full-time special education classes to part-time resource programs or regular class instruction has produced mixed results. Budoff and Gottlieb (1976) (as cited in Madden & Slavin, 1983) failed to find any differences in achievement between students identified as EMR educated in a full-time special education class and a part-time resource class. However, low achieving students with behavioral disturbances gained significantly more when placed in a special individualized resource room program one to two days per week compared to students who remained in their regular classroom (Glavin, Quay, Annesley, & Werry, 1971).

Although research on the academic benefits of mainstreaming has produced mixed results, classroom instructional techniques seem to play an important role. Studies which produced positive results, whether in a special class or regular classroom, overwhelmingly utilized an individualized approach to instruction. In addition, outcomes of several studies indicated that students with low IQ and behavioral disturbances may perform better in special, individualized settings.

RESEARCH CONDUCTED DURING THE 1990S

As school districts comply with the "least restrictive environment" mandate of IDEA, research has examined the effects of inclusion on students with disabilities, their classmates without disabilities, parents, and educators. Professional organizations have offered opinions on inclusion ranging from full support for inclusion to calling for an end to inclusive programs.

Many organizations such as the Learning Disabilities Association of America, the National Education Association, and the National Association of Elementary School Principals support the theory of inclusive education programs only when accompanied by appropriate student placement and sufficient additional resources (The ERIC Review, 1996).

During the 1990s, research began to focus on the effects of inclusion rather than mainstreaming. Proponents of inclusion argue that both students with and without disabilities will benefit socially and academically through education in a regular classroom. However, similar to the research on mainstreaming, research on the academic and social benefits of inclusion has produced mixed results.

RESEARCH ON THE SOCIAL BENEFITS OF INCLUSION

Wagner (as cited in Hocutt, 1996) studied students with emotional/ behavioral disorders and/or Serious Emotional Disturbance. While high-functioning students benefited socially and held constant in academic achievement from placement in the regular classroom, lower-functioning students (i.e., more course failures) were more likely to drop out of school. In contrast, research conducted by Hunt, Farron-Davis, Beckstead, Curtis, and Goetz (1994), found that students with more disability improved significantly in overall quality of IEPs in an inclusive setting, and students with all levels of disabilities significantly increased the amount of time initiating interaction with students without disabilities. Students with less disability did, however, increase significantly on academic objectives, while students with more disability did not.[1]

Hunt and Goetz (1997) reported similar findings when they reviewed the research on the impact of inclusive programs on students with severe disabilities. They found that the majority of parents of students with moderate or severe disabilities believed that educating their child in an inclusive program was positive, both academically and socially. Similarly, parents of students without disabilities believed that having a student with disabilities in their child's classroom had been a positive experience for their child, and had not interfered with their child receiving a good education. Hunt and Goetz also found an increase in the quality of a student's individual education plan (IEP) when they were moved from a special class to the general classroom. Teachers reported benefits for both students with and without disabilities as well as benefits for themselves, such as the awareness of the importance of the teacher as a positive role model for other students. A study conducted by Giangreco et al. (1993) assigned students with severe disabilities to 19 teachers supported with resource professionals and classroom assistants. During the school year, teachers reported improvement in awareness and responsiveness to teachers for the students with disabilities, and a heightened awareness of the needs of people with disabilities for regular education students. Cole and Meyer (1991) conducted a longitudinal analysis over a two-year period of the social integration of students with severe disabilities.

[1] For this study, level of disability was assessed using the Student Descriptor Scale (SDS). The SDS estimates the degree and extent of disability by scoring nine characteristics: intellectual disability, health impairment, upper torso motor impairment, communication disorder, sensory impairment, environmental responsivity, behavior disorder, and need for assistance in toileting. A higher SDS score indicates more disability.

While no significant differences were found on measures of developmental skills, on a measure of social competence, integrated children progressed while segregated children regressed.

Buysse and Bailey (1993) reviewed the research on the behavioral and developmental outcomes of young children in integrated and segregated settings, and found behavioral outcomes to be generally positive. Children in an integrated setting were found to engage in fewer object-directed behaviors, and when integrated children did play with toys, they did so more appropriately and with an increased level of sophistication. Other studies reviewed found no difference between settings on attention to a learning activity or cognitive level of play with toys.

Although both teachers and parents have reported positive results for their children/students educated in an integrated classroom, research has produced mixed results. Some research has suggested that integrated students with disabilities display more appropriate and sophisticated play and progress socially. However, other studies reviewed did not find an increase in developmental skills or cognitive level of play. Two studies reported that the quality of a student's IEP improved when the student was placed in an inclusive setting. Similar to mainstreaming research outcomes, data suggest that lower functioning students with disabilities do not do as well in integrated classrooms as higher functioning students with disabilities.

RESEARCH ON THE ACADEMIC BENEFITS OF INCLUSION

Sharpe, York, and Knight (1994) found no statistically significant differences between regular education students educated in an inclusive environment compared with regular education students educated in a non-inclusive environment, on reading, language arts, mathematics, conduct, and effort. Similarly, Hocutt (1996) reported that elementary students without disabilities in an integrated classroom showed no difference on California Achievement Test (CAT) scores compared to students without disabilities in a regular classroom setting. In addition, Hocutt (1996) reported that students without disabilities in an integrated setting showed greater gains than both students without disabilities in general classes, and students with disabilities in integrated classes, on reading, math, and language skills. This integrated classroom had two teachers, giving a teacher-student ratio of about 1 to 14.

Research has suggested that type of disability and level of functioning should be a consideration when deciding whether to place a child in the regular education classroom. Cole, Mills, Dale, and Jenkins (1991) conducted a study which randomly assigned 124 three to six year olds, the majority of whom had mild to moderate disabilities, to integrated or segregated preschool classrooms. No significant difference was found between children in integrated and segregated classrooms, from pretest to posttest, on the McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities, Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised, Test of Early Language Development, and Test of Early Reading Ability. However, students with higher pretest scores made larger gains with integrated classroom instruction, while lower performing students made larger gains with segregated classroom instruction.

Students with learning disabilities (LD) have been described as the most likely to be overlooked in general education classrooms, and both parent and professional organizations have questioned whether regular education teachers are prepared to teach LD students (Vaughn, Elbaum, & Schumm, (1996). Marston (1996) compared reading scores for students with a learning disability educated using the inclusion-only model (all instruction was in the general

classroom), pull-out model (all instruction was in the resource room only), and combined services model (student received instruction in a pull-out resource room and in the general classroom). The reading progress of students in the combined services model was significantly greater than that of students served by the inclusion-only or pull-out only programs. Other research has shown students with learning disabilities obtain slightly better academic outcomes when served in special education settings. For instance, in a review of the research, Hocutt (1996) found that LD readers gained nearly twice as many new reading words per week in a special education setting. A similar study of 21 LD students found they made small but steady gains when served in the special education classroom, but made no gains when served in the general education classroom. In addition, LD students in general education classrooms report a poorer self-perception of academic competence and behavior than their regular education classmates; however, their self-concept improves as the amount of time they spend in a segregated setting increases.

Baker, Wang, and Walberg (1995) found that special needs students in inclusive settings performed better academically and socially than students in non-inclusive settings; however, the effects were not large. Willrodt and Claybrook (1995) compared Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) reading and math scores for an inclusive fifth grade class at one elementary school, and a non-inclusive fifth grade class at another elementary school. Similar to the previous study, no statistically significant differences were found between students educated in the inclusive setting and the regular education setting. Students' TAAS scores remained constant even with the inclusion of students served by special education.

Research on inclusion has focused on outcomes both for students with disabilities educated in the integrated classroom, as well as the effect their placement has had on their regular education classmates. Data reviewed here suggest that education in an integrated classroom does not have a negative impact on academic measures for students without disabilities. For students with disabilities, students with higher pretest scores performed better in the integrated classroom, while lower performing students with disabilities made larger gains with segregated classroom instruction. Students identified as learning disabled have shown slightly better academic and social outcomes when placed in a segregated setting. Consequently, the decision to implement an inclusive program should not be made solely on expected improvements on academic measures. In fact, while increases in academic achievement for all students is always a goal, the motivation for inclusive education is based on constitutional rights and ethical considerations rather than as a result of research data or theories of learning (Hunt & Goetz, 1997).

CONCLUSION

Research on the social and academic impact of mainstreaming and inclusive settings on students with and without disabilities has produced mixed results for nearly three decades. Some studies suggest that there is the potential for social and academic benefits for students with and without disabilities educated in these inclusive settings. Other researchers have found less optimistic results.

Both professional educational organizations and research studies have emphasized that additional teacher training and sufficient supplemental aids were essential in the implementation of those inclusive programs which have proven to be successful. In addition, research on programs which utilize an individual approach to instruction have produced favorable results, both in special education and regular classrooms. The transition of students with disabilities into any type of inclusive environment without allocating the necessary supplemental supports (teacher assistants, supplementary materials, etc.) will diminish the likelihood of positive results. Changes in funding laws that provide districts with equal funding for integrated and segregated settings are needed to ensure that a comprehensive inclusive program can be made available.

As research continues to be conducted to determine whether inclusion is the best learning environment for social and academic success, we must remember that inclusive education is actually based on constitutional rights which are unaffected by research outcomes. Yet research has suggested that a student's success in an inclusive program will vary depending on a student's disability and level of functioning. Particular types of students, such as older students or those already used to one method of service delivery, may prefer to receive services differently. Therefore, while the right to an inclusive education is given to each student with a disability by law, identifying the best learning environment for a student will still need to be determined on an individual basis.

PART II: STUDY OF FOUR SCHOOLS

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to examine and describe how special education services were being provided in four elementary schools in the Austin Independent School District in the 1997-98 school year. One specific intent was to determine how much, if any, inclusion of students with disabilities in general education classes was occurring. Another intent was to understand better how each school provided for students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment (as mandated in PL 94-142, Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975). For the purposes of this report, inclusion was defined as follows:

> In the inclusive school, all students are educated in general education programs. Inclusion is when a student with special learning and/or behavioral needs is educated full time in the general education program. Essentially, inclusion means that the student with special education needs is attending the general school program and is enrolled in age-appropriate classes 100% of the school day (Idol, 1997, p. 4).

Thus, inclusion is when students with disabilities receive all of their academic program in the general education program. This is different than mainstreaming, which is when a student with disabilities spends a portion of their school day in the general education program and a portion in a separate special education program. Both inclusion and mainstreaming are ways to educate students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment. Following the federal mandate (PL 94-142, Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975), all school districts must define an appropriate least restrictive environment for each child in need of special education services.

RATIONALE

The rationale for this study was to measure and describe what happens in schools as educators move toward more inclusive educational practices. For example, there are several indicators of success with inclusion that are important to examine when trying to understand what happens with a school faculty as they move toward creating inclusive school programs. These indicators are reflected in the questions that were asked of the staff in each of these four elementary schools. These indicators center around several different themes:

- the types of disabilities of the students in special education attending the school;
- the amount of time students in special education actually spend learning in the general education program;
- the number and types of support personnel available and how these personnel are used;
- the number and types of referrals for special education testing;
- the attitudes of all staff toward each other, toward students with special education needs, and toward inclusion;
- staff perceptions of their skills in making both instructional and curricular modifications, as well as in student discipline and classroom management;
- staff perceptions of the impact on inclusion on other students; and

- the perceptions of parents about students with disabilities, inclusion, and the impact on their own children.

Two types of data were gathered in this study: questionnaire and interview data from educators at each campus. It was thought to be important to measure perceptions of all instructional staff, rather than a random sample or only the leaders or the most outspoken on a campus. Thus, in each of the four schools, an effort was made to interview as many educators as possible in the two-day window allocated for gathering data at each campus.

PROCEDURES

SELECTION OF SCHOOLS

The Executive Director of Special Education Programs selected four elementary schools in Austin Independent School District (AISD) for study: Brentwood, Dawson, Pillow, and Zavala Elementary Schools. The criteria for selection were that each school had a well-developed special education program and that staff at each campus felt their approach to the education of students with disabilities was appropriate. That is, these schools were selected because the principals and faculty from each campus had indicated that they offered a strong and supportive program for students with special education needs.

The schools varied in the degree to which students with special education needs were taught in the general education programs. Refer to Table 1 for descriptive information about each of the schools, including the following: total number of students enrolled, number of students served by special education, number of classroom teachers, the number and types of special education and other service delivery options, number of teacher assistants, and types of other support staff specific to campuses (each campus had a counselor, speech/language pathologist, art teacher, music teacher, physical education teacher, librarian, and a part-time registered nurse and school health assistant).

DATA COLLECTION

The evaluator visited each of the four schools for the equivalent of two days at each campus and interviewed principals, assistant principals, classroom teachers, special education teachers, special area teachers (counselors, speech/language pathologists, computer lab teachers, physical education teachers, music teachers, art teachers), and teacher assistants, resulting in 125 interviews. There were five administrators and four teacher assistants (one at each school) interviewed. Also interviewed were 79 classrooms teachers (75% of total across schools), 24 special education teachers (92% of total across schools), and 13 support staff (50% across schools).

A structured interview was conducted privately with each individual. In a few cases, teachers who taught together were interviewed together at their request. As many people as possible were interviewed at each campus. Exceptions were only if staff members were not available at the time of the site visit.

Table 1: Campus Characteristics of Four Elementary Schools, 1997-98

School	Number of Students	Number of Students with disabilities	Number of Classroom Teachers	Number and Types of Special Education and Other Service Delivery Options	Number Assistants	Types of Other Support Staff
Brentwood	547	87	26 (K-5) 1 Pre-K	3 Title I Teachers 2 Content Mastery Teachers 2 Classes (students with behavioral challenges) 2 Classes (students with auditory impairment)	5	
Dawson	490	94	22 (K-5) 3 Pre-K (1 Bilingual) 2 Early Childhood	1 Content Mastery Teacher 2 Reading Recovery Teachers 2 Early Childhood Classes 1 Resource Room Teacher 3 Partial Self-Contained Classes 2 Life Skills Classes 1 Extend-A-Care Program	10	Adaptive Physical Education Art Therapist Music Therapist
Pillow	556	73	23 (K-5) 2 Pre-K 1 Pre-K Daycare	2 Content Mastery Teachers 2 Classes (students with behavioral challenges) 2 Functional Skills Class	5	Computer Lab Instructor Adaptive Physical Education Teacher Dance Instructor
Zavala	473	57	26 (K-6)	1 Special Education Consulting Teacher (all classes are inclusive) 1 Reading Recovery Teacher	3	Social Worker Host Lab Tutorial Service

The interviews were structured around questions specific to the roles of the educators being interviewed. The structured interviews or questionnaires are contained in the following appendices:

- Appendix A: Principal Interview;
- Appendix B: Classroom Teacher and Special Area Teacher Interview;
- Appendix C: Special Education Teacher Interview; and
- Appendix D: Teacher assistant Interview.

In each interview, the evaluator gave the interviewee a copy of the questionnaire to read while the evaluator asked questions and wrote responses on a second copy of the same questionnaire.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A small group of parents in each school were surveyed. A copy of the survey administered to the parents can be found in Appendix E. This information was gathered using written responses. The evaluator asked each principal to determine the best way to obtain parental feedback in order to gather some general impressions from a mix of parents of students served by general education and special education. At Brentwood, the assistant principal gave the questionnaire to six parents, all of whom responded. At Dawson, the principal sent the surveys home to 50 parents; 15 parents responded. At Pillow, the surveys were given to three parents, all of whom responded. At Zavala, the assistant principal gave the surveys (in English and Spanish) to eight parents and to one child's family friend, who all responded. Two parents responded in Spanish. Multiple choice data were coded for quantitative analysis and qualitative responses were recorded in their entirety.

RESULTS

DESCRIPTIONS OF FOUR SCHOOLS

Brentwood Elementary School

The Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) at Brentwood did not include planning for inclusion nor for special education. However, during 1997-98, the staff were working on this, and the assistant principal hoped to have a plan for inclusion for the 1998-99 year.

In the past, the principal encouraged teachers to include students with disabilities as much as possible. During 1997-98, the staff at Brentwood worked on mainstreaming students with emotional disturbances. Two such students were attending the general classroom program nearly full time. A part-time teacher assistant position supported the classroom teachers of these students.

Brentwood had a multi-age program where two grade levels were combined and the classes were co-taught by two teachers using connected rooms. The faculty were assessing the multi-age program and some faculty wanted to see how inclusion could be better fitted within the multi-age program. In the beginning, Brentwood received an inclusion grant and funded the first multi-age class with those monies. Since then, more classes have been added. The multi-age concept had been controversial among the faculty. Those involved with it tended to favor it.

More specific aspects of program support at Brentwood are described as follows. Included is information pertaining to the various funding sources for special education programming, the types of special education service delivery options utilized, and other types of teaming structures used at Brentwood to support collaborative efforts among classroom teachers and special education teachers.

Funding Sources

1. district special education allocations for eight special education teachers
2. district allocations for five teacher assistants
3. $100 per special education staff received from district special education office
4. per pupil allocation
5. one inclusion grant four years ago; none at the time of the interview
6. school adopters, including mentoring program for students with disabilities

7. fund raisers

Types of Special Education Service Delivery

1. one teacher who worked as a consulting teacher and as a cooperative teacher
2. the same teacher as a resource teacher
3. six special education classes (four self-contained classes and 2 content mastery classes)

Other Types of Teaming Structures

1. grade level teams
2. campus advisory council

Dawson Elementary School

The Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) at Dawson did not include planning for inclusion nor for special education. The principal was new to the campus in 1997-98 and was working with an inherited CIP. The principal felt a goal for special needs students should be included in the plan. As of 1997-98, inclusion was only occurring with one student in fourth grade and one in fifth grade.

In her first year at the school, the principal supported the special education program by focusing on literacy. One-half day each month was spent on staff development in building literacy. In addition, the special education staff attended an early literacy conference in Dallas.

At Dawson, classroom teachers who included students with disabilities in their classes were supported in several different ways. For example, the school counselor trained five new classroom teachers separately and included strategies for working with students with disabilities. In addition, the school was linked to the students' homes with a strong family involvement program, and translators were provided for Spanish-speaking families.

The principal reported not having a strong Student Assistance Program (a pre-referral system) and wanted to have that in place the following year. Groups of teachers would be represented on this team, with all teachers rotating assignments to the team. It was anticipated that this team would provide assistance for all students, including students with disabilities.

More specific aspects of program support at Dawson are described as follows. Included is information pertaining to the various funding sources for special education programming, the types of special education service delivery options utilized, and other types of teaming structures used at Dawson to support collaborative efforts among classroom teachers and special education teachers.

Funding Sources

1. district special education allocations for nine special education teachers
2. district general education allocations for two Reading Recovery teachers
3. district allocations for 10 teacher assistants
4. per pupil allocation
5. $100 per each special education staff received from district special education office; $200 each for early childhood and life skills classes
6. cross-funding with Title I program
7. grant monies (Academic 2000)
8. school adopters

Types of Special Education Service Delivery

1. resource room program (The resource program used a varied curriculum at the discretion of the special education staff. They were independent of the general education program.)
2. cooperative teaching (used in the early childhood and Kindergarten programs)

Other Types of Teaming Structures

1. grade level teams
2. campus advisory council (They were interested in developing teacher assistance teams.)

Pillow Elementary School

The Pillow staff were in the process of revising their CIP. They have had inclusion in place for four years but it was not reflected in the plan. Three years ago, three self-contained classes were added for students with behavioral challenges. Some of these students were mainstreamed when possible and where appropriate.

At Pillow, a unit/pod approach was taken for organizing the instructional units. The units consisted of five classes (Kindergarten through grade five). These classes were physically located together in one of four separate pods in the building. Teachers within each unit worked as a cooperative team. A special educator was assigned to each unit.

During the past four years, Pillow supported movement toward inclusion of students with disabilities in the general classrooms by maintaining two self-contained classes for students with behavior disorders. These classes receive students from other schools. These students were mainstreamed as much as possible. Mainstreaming was done on a child-by-child basis.

During 1997-98, the special education teachers had six days of training funded by their EXCEL Grant. Stipends were provided for all teachers. All six special education teachers had much autonomy in how their programs were conceptualized and implemented. According to the administration, guidelines were not set for special education teachers. The principal provided these teachers with materials and resources and collaborated with them in assigning students to the various units. In previous years, the classroom teachers who had students with disabilities in their classes were supported by having a pull-out resource program for students with learning disabilities, providing use of an alternative curriculum, and blocking a unit of time for language arts during which time students with learning disabilities went to the resource program.

During 1997-98, the principal provided support to these teachers by having a school policy where students are not labeled as having a specific disability once they have been identified for special education funding purposes, providing pull-out services on an as-needed basis, offering Project READ, and assigning a special education teacher to each unit/pod. The special educators were responsible for case management, crisis intervention, consulting, supporting instructors by bringing in outside resources, and, in some cases, serving as cooperative teacher.

Pillow offered a dance instruction program for all students, including students with disabilities. This program culminated in a end-of-year program at the University of Texas Performing Arts Center. One special education child, who could not learn the dance steps, had a special part where she was a butterfly who flitted across the stage intermittently throughout the

show. The dance program at Pillow is a good illustration of the creative capabilities of teachers in designing appropriate modifications for children with special needs.

More specific aspects of program support of Pillow are described as follows. Included is information pertaining to the various funding sources for special education programming, the types of special education service delivery options utilized, and other types of teaming structures used at Pillow to support collaborative efforts among classroom teachers and special education teachers.

Funding Sources

1. district special education allocations for six special education teachers
2. district special education allocations for five teacher assistants
3. per pupil allocation
4. $200 per special education unit (n=4) received from district special education office
5. EXCEL Grant ($32,000)
6. 43 school adopters
7. general budget includes special education
8. enrichment funds from the PTA

Types of Special Education Service Delivery

1. consulting teacher
2. cooperative teacher
3. content mastery resource room (as needed for any student with a curriculum supportive of the regular education curriculum)
4. two self-contained units for students with behavioral challenges
5. two life skills classes

Other Types of Teaming Structures

1. vertical teams (K-5)
2. campus advisory council
3. campus improvement planning team
4. committees of excellence (monitor the CIP and facilitate special activities)

Zavala Elementary School

Five years ago, there was only one specific strategy for special education included in the CIP at Zavala. However, at the time of this study, special education was an integrated part of the total school plan. All students with disabilities were taught in the general education program. There were no pull-out programs for academic instruction, although children were pulled out of the general education classroom for speech and language therapy.

Five years ago, there were also no district staff development opportunities for inclusion. As a result, the staff at Zavala had to create their own vision. They did a lot of brainstorming and reported receiving little help from district resources. Now, Zavala staff provide training to other schools. They have provided staff development training for 60 teachers district wide, using stipend and grant monies to release teachers to provide the training. They received a special award for this work. They have recently written an inclusion grant proposal with a University of Texas professor. They have also provided substitute teachers for teachers to be released for more training and preparation. They have sent the counselor and the special education staff out for inclusion training.

The principal reported supporting teachers by giving them staff development in the areas they requested. This was true for both special education and classroom teachers.

Zavala had only one special education teacher who worked both as a consulting teacher and as a cooperative teacher. In !997-98, the monies for the second teacher position were used to fund three teacher assistants. The assistants were then rotated across the classes. Emphasis was placed on appropriate identification of learning needs and on taking developmental progress into consideration.

There was much parental involvement at this school. Parent training was provided with the Read-To-Me Program. Babies in each family were given bibs that read "Born to Read". Students earned T-shirts for reading 10 or more books. The school librarian was heavily involved in this program, as well as the total school-wide effort to improve reading. She was regarded by the faculty as a very important resource for their literacy program, which included using computers in the library for children to check their understanding of library books they had read.

More specific aspects of program support of Zavala are described as follows. Included is information pertaining to the various funding sources for special education programming, the types of special education service delivery options utilized, and other types of teaming structures used at Zavala to support collaborative efforts among classroom teachers and special education teachers.

Funding Sources

1. district special education allocations for one special education teacher
2. district allocations for three teacher assistants
3. per pupil allocation
4. $100 per special education staff received from district special education office (one teacher position was traded for three teacher assistants)
5. grant monies
6. many school adopters, including tutors from businesses, churches, and the University of Texas
7. Rainwater Foundation
8. Junior League

Types of Special Education Service Delivery

1. one teacher who works as a consulting teacher and as a cooperative teacher, depending on the class.

Other Types of Teaming Structures

1. grade level teams
2. campus advisory council

Incidence and Types of Disabilities Conditions

The number and types of students with disabilities on each campus varied considerably (see Table 2). Dawson, the school with the longest history of serving students with disabilities and busing them from other neighborhoods, had the most (n = 94; comprising 19% of students on the campus). This was followed by Brentwood with nearly as many students (n = 87; 16%).

Pillow had about 21 fewer students than Dawson (n = 73; 13%) and Zavala had nearly the same percentage as Dawson (n = 57; 12%). Zavala was also the only school that included all of the students with disabilities in the general education program 100% of the time. Students at Zavala are pulled out of the classroom only for speech/language intervention.

Table 2: Number and Percentage of Types of
Primary Disabilities of Students with Disabilities at Four Schools

Disabilities Conditions	Brentwood		Dawson		Pillow		Zavala		Total
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Auditory	25	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Autism	0	0	2	2	2	3	0	0	4
Emotional Disturbance	13	15	6	6	10	14	2	4	31
Learning Disabilities	20	23	25	27	26	36	32	56	103
Multiple	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	2
Mental Retardation	3	4	8	9	9	12	1	2	21
Orthopedic	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	2
Other Health Impairment	7	8	6	6	16	22	3	5	32
Speech Impairment	19	22	43	46	10	14	19	33	91
TOTAL	87		94		73		57		311

Table 2 is a compilation of all the types of primary disabilities represented by these students across the four schools. Approximately one-third of the students were identified as having learning disabilities. Only Brentwood had students with auditory impairments. Brentwood and Pillow had more students with emotional disturbances, and only Dawson had students with multiple and/or orthopedic disabilities. Pillow had many more students with other health impairments. Dawson had many more students with speech impairments but this school had the largest number of students in special education. Across all four schools, there were more students with emotional disturbances and other health impairments than there were students with mental retardation.

Overall, the number of students with a disability seems to be related to how far along each school is with inclusion. For example, Zavala has made the most advances with inclusion (refer to Table 2) and they had the fewest number of students with disabilities. However, nearly all of the students at Zavala were reported as being at risk for school failure. Dawson had the most students with disabilities and also the largest number of special education programs where students were pulled out of the general classroom for services (refer to Table 1). Brentwood had all of the students with auditory impairments and the second largest number of students with disabilities. Pillow had fewer students with disabilities than Dawson and Brentwood but had

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

more students with multiple and more severe disabilities conditions than did Zavala. Zavala had more students included for more time in the regular education program (refer to Table 3).

Table 3: Number and Percentage of Students with Disabilities by Time Taught in General Education Classes At Four Schools

% Time	Brentwood		Dawson		Pillow		Zavala		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
0 %	25	25	5	6	19	32	0	0	49	17
< 25 %	35	35	46	53	1	2	0	0	82	29
25 - 50 %	0	0	7	8	18	.31	0	0	25	9
51 - 75 %	1	1	14	16	0	.00	0	0	15	5
76 - 99 %	38	38	13	15	21	.36	0	0	72	25
100 %	1	1	2	2	0	0	37	100	40	14
TOTAL	100		87		59		37		283	

*special education teachers' documentation of student with disabilities and time spent in general education

Time Spent in General Education

The special education teachers documented the approximate amount of time each student with disabilities spent in the general education program. (In their reports they did not account for 28 students with disabilities who were on the district count). The data these teachers reported were organized into six intervals ranging from 0% to 100% of the time spent in the grade level classes (refer to Table 3). Aside from Zavala, where all students with disabilities are educated in general education, there were only three students (one at Brentwood and two at Dawson) who were included 100% time. There were no students at Pillow included 100% of the time, but 14 students were included 90% time. At each of the schools where inclusion is not practiced, there were students with disabilities spending from 75-99% of their time in general education classes (38% at Brentwood; 36% at Pillow; but only 15% at Dawson). In contrast, there were large numbers of students at Brentwood, Dawson, and Pillow who spent either no time or less than 25% of their time with general education students (60% at Brentwood; 59% at Dawson; 34% at Pillow).

Roles of the Special Education Teachers

In total, 24 special education teachers were interviewed. They all fulfilled the job they were assigned to do. For example, if they were assigned to a self-contained unit, they served as a self-contained teacher, or to a resource program as a resource teacher, and so on. Yet, some of them managed to spend time with classroom teachers helping students with disabilities succeed in the general education program as well. Eight of them spent a portion of their time as consulting teachers to classroom teachers, planning together to implement programs for students with disabilities in the general education program. Nine of them spent some time as cooperative teachers, teaching students with disabilities in the general education classes with the classroom teachers. .

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Referrals for Special Education Testing

Table 4 is a compilation of the special education referral data for each of the schools. The proportion of students referred for academic problems is remarkably similar across the four schools, ranging from 2-3% of the total school population. There was only one referral for behavioral problems at Zavala, and nine referrals of three other types at Zavala, four of which were for speech therapy. The other schools did not provide speech referral data, as it was not requested.

Table 4: Summary Data on Referrals to Special Education

School	Number	Type
Brentwood	9	Academics
	0	Behavior
Dawson	12	Academics
	0	Behavior
Pillow	14	Academics
	0	Behavior
Zavala	11	Academics
	2	Other Health Impairments
	1	Behavior
	4	Speech
	3	Occupational Therapy

Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Inclusion

Three principals (Dawson, Pillow and Zavala) and two assistant principals (Dawson and Brentwood) were interviewed. The principal at Brentwood was on medical leave, and the assistant principal was the acting principal.

All of the administrators reported they were very much in favor of inclusion. The principal at Dawson indicated that she was more in favor of it this year than last year. All of them also said their attitudes toward students with disabilities were very supportive. None of the administrators were in favor of inclusion without extra support to the classroom teacher. All of the administrators said they were good collaborators and worked well with the teachers. Two of six of them said they had improved in their collaborative work within the last year.

When asked how they thought students with disabilities were best educated, three of them said their first choice was for the students to attend grade level classes with a special educator or assistant. Another administrator chose this option as a strong second choice. Two administrators' first choice was to educate students with disabilities in grade level classes with supportive resource services. [Supportive resource services meant that the classroom and the resource teacher planned together so that the resource curriculum corresponded to the classroom curriculum.] Only one chose to mainstream students with disabilities only part time, and this was a second choice. All of the administrators thought inclusion would be best implemented if extra adults were provided to work with any student needing assistance, not just with students in need of special education.

Attitudes of Faculty Toward Principal

In the past decade, principals and their leadership styles have gradually changed from principals serving exclusively as administrative managers to combining management with the role of instructional leaders. Instructional leadership means the principal is actively involved with teachers in making instructional and curricular decisions and spends time in classrooms as a leader in shaping the development of programs. All 120 educators interviewed were asked which of these two roles best described their principal. On every campus there were mixed responses: the majority at Zavala (79%), Dawson (70%), and to a lesser degree, Pillow (56%) viewed their principal as being both an instructional leader and an administrative manager. At Brentwood, 28% thought the principal filled both roles, but the majority (59%) thought of the principal as an administrative manager (see Table 5).

Educators in two schools, Pillow (96%) and Zavala (94%), viewed the principal as being "very supportive of inclusion." At Brentwood, 76% of the faculty gave this rating, but only 30% of the faculty at Dawson rated their principal as being very supportive of inclusion. At Dawson, however, 37% did not rate the principal because this was her first year at Dawson and they were not certain as to her stance.

These educators also tended to rate their principals high on being *supportive* of them as professionals. Across schools, the majority said their principals were *very supportive* of them. Very few individuals said otherwise; across schools only 13 individuals said the principal was *somewhat supportive* and only three individuals said the principal was *not supportive* of them. All (100%) of the respondents at Zavala, 89% at Dawson, 82% at Brentwood, and 74% at Pillow said their principal was very supportive of them.

Educators' Skills in Accommodating Students with Challenging Needs

Teachers and teacher assistants were asked to rate themselves in three skill areas related to effective inclusion of students with disabilities: 1) adaptation of instruction, 2) modification of curriculum, and 3) student discipline and classroom management (see Table 6). They were asked to select one of the following options: 1=very skilled; 2=applying the skill; 3=practicing the skill to learn it; or 4=needing more information about the skill. Data are reported by frequency, percentage, and mode. The mode data reflect the most frequently occurring responses and are presented in Table 6 in boldface type.

Generally, educators in all four schools reported that they were *applying the skills* in each of the three skill areas. However, at Brentwood, 42% of the teachers rated themselves as being *very skilled* at making adaptations for students with disabilities. Also at Brentwood, teachers rated themselves higher on adapting instruction for students with disabilities than for students who were at risk of school failure. At Dawson and Pillow the second most frequently occurring response was viewing themselves as being very skilled with both types of students.

The Zavala responses are interesting because the teachers in this school are more involved with inclusion than in the other schools; yet, 21% report they need more practice with students with disabilities and 24% with students who are at risk for school failure. The Zavala educators may have a clearer perception of what is needed for successful inclusion, as they are doing more of it.

Table 5: Percentage of Faculty Perceptions of Principal Leadership Style

School	Instructional Leader	Administrative Manager	Both
Brentwood *	6%	59%	28%
Dawson	7%	22%	70%
Pillow	26%	19%	56%
Zavala	6%	15%	79%

* Six percent of the Brentwood faculty did not respond to the item. Data were rounded to the nearest whole number.

Table 6: Frequency and Percentage Responses of Educators' Perceptions of Skills in Accommodating Special Education and At-Risk Students in the Classroom

Skill: Type of Student	School	Very Skilled		Applying the Skill		Practicing the Skill		Need More Information		No Response	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
		Adapting Instruction:									
Special Education	Brentwood	14*	42	13*	39	3	9	2	6	1	3
	Dawson	10	37	11	41	4	15	2	7	0	0
	Pillow	6	22	15	56	5	19	1	3	0	0
	Zavala	5	15	11	33	7	21	8	24	2	6
At Risk	Brentwood	11	34	16	48	5	15	1	3	0	0
	Dawson	8	30	13	48	1	4	3	11	2	7
	Pillow	10	37	14	52	2	7	1	4	0	0
	Zavala	7	21	14	42	8	24	2	7	2	6
		Modifying Instruction:									
Special Education	Brentwood	10	30	15	45	3	9	3	9	2	6
	Dawson	4	15	11	41	6	22	4	15	2	7
	Pillow	8	30	11	41	7	26	1	4	0	0
	Zavala	5	16	4	12	11	33	9	27	4	12
At Risk	Brentwood	8	24	14	42	8	24	1	3	2	6
	Dawson	4	15	13	48	2	7	5	19	3	11
	Pillow	10	37	12	44	4	15	1	4	0	0
	Zavala	8	25	9	28	11	33	2	6	3	9
		Discipline and Management:									
Special Education	Brentwood	14	42	13	39	3	9	2	6	1	3
	Dawson	11	41	9	33	4	15	2	7	1	4
	Pillow	14	52	6	22	6	22	1	4	0	0
	Zavala	10	30	12	36	3	9	6	18	2	6
At Risk	Brentwood	13	39	16	48	3	9	0	0	1	3
	Dawson	7	26	12	44	3	11	3	11	2	7
	Pillow	13	48	10	37	3	11	1	4	0	0
	Zavala	13	39	11	33	4	12	3	9	2	6

* Percentage data were rounded to the nearest whole number;

Note: 40 Likert-scale was used (1=very skilled; 2=applying the skill; 3=practicing the skill to learn it; 4=need more information about the skill); highest frequency of response is shaded.

The responses were similar across three schools (Brentwood, Dawson and Pillow) for making curricular adaptations for students with disabilities and students at risk for school failure, with the majority at each school reporting themselves as applying this skill but not being highly

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

skilled. At Zavala, 33% of the educators reported themselves as practicing (i.e., working on developing the skill) to make curricular modifications with both special education and students who were at risk. However, a combined percentage of 53% said they were either applying the skill or were very skilled at making curricular adaptations for students who are at risk for school failure.

For student discipline and classroom management, teachers at Brentwood and Dawson perceived themselves as being more skilled with students with disabilities than with students at risk for school failure. The reverse was true at Zavala, where teachers tended to think of themselves as being more skilled in working with students who were at risk than with students with disabilities. One explanation for this finding might be that Brentwood and Dawson had more students with disabilities and more who were more seriously challenged. At Pillow, the majority of teachers thought they were very skilled at making adaptations for either population (52% for students with disabilities and 48% for students who were at risk).

Educators' Attitudes Toward Teaching Students with Disabilities

Teachers were asked to report their attitudes on teaching students with disabilities in 1996-97 and again in 1997-98 by selecting one of the response choices listed in the footnote of Table 7.1. There was little change in attitudes about inclusion and about students with disabilities across the four schools from 1996-97 to 1997-98. Attitudes toward inclusion tended to range between staff being willing to accept and to try inclusion and to being very much in favor of inclusion. (Note the Zavala responses indicate staff are slightly more in favor of inclusion at this campus where inclusion is practiced.)

Similarly, attitudes toward students with disabilities were positive and indicated that most educators across schools were supportive of these students. There was also little change between attitudes the year of this study (1997-98) and the previous year. (Note in Table 7.1 how similar the means are across schools between the two time periods.)

Table 7.1 Educators' Averaged Attitudes Toward Teaching Students with Disabilities in the Classroom

Attitudes Toward	Brentwood		Dawson		Pillow		Zavala	
	1996-97	1997-98	1996-97	1997-98	1996-97	1997-98	1996-97	1997-98
Inclusion*	1.81	1.84	2.00	2.00	1.63	1.56	1.42	1.46
Students with Disabilities**	1.12	1.12	1.07	1.07	1.30	1.26	1.30	1.27
Working Collaboratively with Other Teachers***	1.69	1.72	1.48	1.63	1.37	1.30	1.49	1.52

**For Inclusion:* [1=very much in favor; 2=willing to accept and try it; 3=willing to accept if others do it; 4=it is not appropriate.]

***For Students with Disabilities*: [1=very supportive; 2=willing to accept in my class; 3=willing to accept for other teachers; 4=not supportive of public school attendance.]

****For Collaboration:* [1=others view me as a good collaborator; 2=work with other teachers; 3=willing to work with other teachers; 4=prefer to work alone.]

Educators were asked to rate themselves on how collaboratively they worked with other adults. (See the footnote on Table 7.1). Their perceptions of how well they collaborated with

colleagues were very positive. For all four schools, the averaged responses fell between 1 (others view me as a good collaborator) and 2 (I work with other teachers). The responses were highest at Pillow ($\underline{x}$= 1.30), but all schools had responses ranging between thinking others thought of them as being collaborative to being willing to work with other teachers. Very few responses fell outside of this range.

The data in Table 7.2 pinpoint educators' attitudes more precisely. They were asked to respond to two items pertaining to how and where to best teach students with disabilities. The responses for each of the two items are listed in Table 7.2. Across all four schools, only two individuals thought students with disabilities should be taught in self-contained special education classes and no one thought they should be educated on separate special education campuses.

At Brentwood, most educators favored teaching students with disabilities in grade level classes with either a special educator (teacher or teacher assistant) with them (33%) or with supportive resource services (33%). At Dawson, most favored either grade level classes with the special educator in the class (33%) or mainstreamed classes with part-time special education (30%). At Pillow, the preferred choice was grade level classes with the special educator present (30%), although supportive resource services (22%) and mainstreamed classes with part-time special education classes (22%) were also common choices. Even though inclusion is practiced at Zavala, the majority also thought the special education teacher or teacher assistant should accompany the students (58%).

A few educators thought students with disabilities could be in the general education classes without the special educator or assistant accompanying them. In order of highest percentages, there were 15% at Zavala; 12% at Brentwood; 11% at Pillow; and 7% at Dawson. Note the percentage at Zavala, where they include all students with disabilities in general education, is twice that at Dawson, where they do not.

The responses to the question of how to teach students with disabilities most effectively in general education classes were compelling. In every school, nearly all of the educators thought the best choice was to include students with disabilities with general education students and have available adults work with any student needing assistance.

The Impact of Inclusion on Other Students

Educators' perceptions of changes in general education students as a result of educating students with disabilities in the grade level classroom were also examined. Educators were asked to rate the impact of the presence of students with disabilities, in general, on the other students across seven variables: academic skills, course grades, TAAS scores, social behaviors, student's attitude toward students with disabilities, student's attitude toward inclusion, and parent's attitudes toward inclusion. Specifically, educators were asked if the other students improved, were about the same, or were worse as a result of being educated with a student with disabilities. Table 8.1 lists these six variables by school and includes the frequencies and percentages of the responses. A few interviewees did not know about the impact (9%) and some had no students with disabilities in their classes (17%). (In the latter case, some respondents had opinions while others did not which explains the fluctuations in the number of responses for no students with disabilities in the class.)

Table 7.2: Frequency of Educators' Choices for How and Where to Best Teach Students with Disabilities

Item 1: In general, I believe students with special education needs are best educated in:

First Choice	Brentwood		Dawson		Pillow		Zavala		Total Percent
	n	% *	n	%	n	%	n	%	
grade level classes	4	12	2	7	3	11	5	15	12
grade level classes with special education teacher or assistant in classroom with them	11	33	9	33	8	30	19	58	39
grade level classes with supportive resource services	11	33	4	15	6	22	5	15	22
mainstreamed classes with part-time in special education classes	5	15	8	30	6	22	3	9	18
self-contained, special education classes	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	3	2
separate, special education campuses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[could not select a single first choice]	2	6	4	15	3	11	0	0	0
TOTAL Number	33		27		27		33		120

* Percentage data were rounded to the nearest whole number.

Item 2: When students with special education needs are taught in their grade level classes, they are best taught by:

First Choice	Brentwood		Dawson		Pillow		Zavala		Total Percent
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
including them with all students and having all available adults work with any student needing assistance	24	75	22	82	22	82	26	81	80
having them work with an teacher assistant	5	16	3	4	1	4	1	3	9
having them work with the special educator	3	9	2	15	4	15	5	16	12
TOTAL Number	32		27		27		32		118

* Two interviewees did not respond.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 8.1: Reported Impact on Other Students as a Result of Educating Students with Disabilities in the Classroom Across Four Schools

Question: When students with disabilities are included in your class, what is the impact on other students in the class?

Variables	School	Improved		About The Same		Worse		Do Not Know		No Students with disabilities	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Student academic skills	Brentwood	5	15	22	66	0	0	3	9	3	9
	Dawson	1	4	19	70	0	0	6	22	1	4
	Pillow	7	26	19	70	0	0	0	0	1	4
	Zavala	7	21	18	55	1	3	1	3	6	18
Grades	Brentwood	4	12	8	24	1	3	0	0	16	48
	Dawson	0	0	11	41	2	7	6	22	8	30
	Pillow	6	22	11	41	3	11	0	0	7	26
	Zavala	5	15	10	30	1	3	1	3	16	48
TAAS scores	Brentwood	13	39	10	30	6	18	2	6	2	6
	Dawson	10	37	8	30	2	7	6	22	1	4
	Pillow	14	52	9	33	3	11	0	0	1	4
	Zavala	8	24	10	30	8	24	1	3	6	18
Attitude toward students with disabilities	Brentwood	24	73	4	12	1	3	3	9	1	3
	Dawson	17	63	4	15	0	0	6	22	0	0
	Pillow	21	78	5	19	0	0	0	0	1	4
	Zavala	18	55	8	24	0	0	1	3	6	18
Attitude toward students with inclusion	Brentwood	22	67	4	12	1	3	3	9	3	9
	Dawson	8	30	8	30	1	4	7	26	3	11
	Pillow	14	52	9	33	0	0	1	4	3	11
	Zavala	15	45	8	24	1	3	1	3	8	24
Parental attitudes toward inclusion	Brentwood	11	33	8	24	2	6	5	15	7	21
	Dawson	9	33	4	15	2	7	7	26	5	19
	Pillow	10	37	8	30	2	7	0	0	7	26
	Zavala	12	36	6	18	3	9	2	6	10	30
Total Responses Across Schools		261	36	231	32	40	6	62	9	122	17

Across the four schools, the respondents reported that the other students in the classroom remained unaffected by the presence of students with disabilities in the class. The majority (68%), across the four schools, thought the others students were improved (36%) or about the same (32%) across the six variables. (Overall, according to the educators, the impact of including students with disabilities in the classroom was not harmful to other students.) Only 6%, across schools, responded that the other students were adversely affected by the presence of the students with disabilities in the general education classes. Eleven percent or fewer of the respondents at each campus thought other students were worse across the following five variables: student academic skills, grades, students' attitudes toward students with disabilities, students' attitudes toward inclusion, and parental attitudes toward inclusion.

Overall, 36% respondents reported that having students with disabilities in general education classes resulted in an increase in TAAS scores of general education students; and 33% reported that TAAS scores of general education students remained the same.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 8.2 offers an alternative method of examining the responses to the impact of students with disabilities on other students, which again illustrates the overall positive response to the query regarding the impact of students with disabilities on other students. Two notable exceptions were at Brentwood and Zavala, where more teachers thought the TAAS scores of other students were worse because of repeating curriculum, going slower, and/or lowering standards. If this were the case, students academic skills and grades should also be lower in these two schools, and this was not the case. At Brentwood, scores increased by 19 percentage points for reading, 61 for math, and 33 for writing from 1993-94 to 1997-98. At Zavala, the percentage points increased 35 for math and 15 for writing; and remained nearly the same for reading (60% for 1993-94 and 57% for 1997-98).

In two of the four schools (Brentwood and Pillow), educators reported student attitudes toward students with disabilities had improved as a result of inclusion. At Zavala, attitudes toward disabilities remained about the same. There were few students with more severe types of special education challenges (mental retardation, emotional disturbance, other health impairments). Rather, 90% of the Zavala students with disabilities had mild problems (learning disabilities or speech problems), which are not as readily apparent to observers. This could influence attitude toward disabilities.

Only at Dawson did other students in general education exhibit improved social behaviors from the reports of the teachers. (The reader is reminded that mainstreaming, not inclusion, of students with disabilities is practiced at Dawson; mainstreaming is when a portion of the time is spent in general education and inclusion is when all of the time is spent in general education.) In the other three schools, social behaviors of other students remained about the same. These results are important because educators are sometimes concerned that the presence of students with disabilities will cause other students to be disruptive, especially with students with disabilities with emotional disturbance. (The reader is reminded that there are students with emotional disturbance at all four schools; Brentwood (n=13) and Pillow (n=10) have the most (see Table 2).

Table 8.2: Summary of Educators' Attitudes Regarding Impact of Inclusion on General Education Students

School	Improved	About the Same	Worse
Brentwood	Attitude toward disabilities	Student academic skills Attitude toward inclusion Grades Social behaviors Parental attitude/inclusion	TAAS scores
Dawson	Attitude toward student social behaviors	Student academic skills Attitude toward disabilities Grades Attitude toward inclusion TAAS scores Parental attitudes/inclusion	None
Pillow	Attitude toward disabilities	Student academic skills Grades TAAS scores Student social behaviors Attitude toward inclusion Parental attitudes/inclusion	None
Zavala	None	Student academic skills Grades Student social behaviors Attitude toward disabilities Attitude toward inclusion Parental attitudes/inclusion	TAAS scores

Averaged TAAS Scores for Four Schools

TAAS scores for each of the four schools for the years 1993-94 and 1997-98 are compiled in Tables 10.1-10.4 in Appendix H. These data provide information regarding the effect of mainstreaming or including students with disabilities on the overall TAAS results. TAAS data were compared between the years 1993-94 and 1997-98. The year 1993-94 was selected because this was the first year of TAAS testing in the district after the test had been reconfigured and it is the longest span of time, four years, that students have been tested in this way. In Tables 10.1-10.4 note that columns 6-17 each reflect two numbers: the number of students at each grade level who took the TAAS test at each school and the number of students who passed the test with minimal mastery. The latter is also reflected by a percentage of passing students in column 2.

The most striking finding is that with one exception, each of the four schools made noticeable improvement in averaged student TAAS scores over a period of four years (see columns 2-3). The only exception was at Zavala where third graders' average scores remained about the same (60% in 1993-4 and 57% in 1997-98). Impressive growth was evidenced at

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Zavala in fourth and fifth grades, as well as at each of the other three schools in all areas. Overall, each of the four schools made substantial improvements on TAAS scores over a four-year period of time in reading, math, and writing (see columns 12-16). The positive shift at Dawson is particularly noticeable.

In each of these schools efforts have been made to include students with disabilities for portions of the school day (mainstreaming) and to include (100%) some of them in general education classes. These data provide evidence that the presence of students with disabilities in the general education program has not been deleterious to the test performance of the general education students. This finding is further substantiated by the general impressions of the teachers interviewed, as well (refer to the section on Qualitative Responses of Educators Toward Inclusion).

Students with Disabilities Exempted from TAAS Testing

There was variation in how testing of students with disabilities was handled at each of these four schools. Table 9 compares the percentage of students with disabilities reported as being exempted from TAAS testing for 1993-94 and 1997-98 for the four schools. Brentwood remained about the same (15% and 16% respectively). Dawson exempted 51% in 1993-94 and reduced this number to 32% in 1997-98. Pillow had a reverse trend; in 1993-94 17% of the students were exempted and in 1997-98, 34% were exempted. Also, during this same time period, more self-contained special education classes were added at Pillow. The percentage of exempted students at Zavala showed a slight decrease; 67% in 1993-94 and 60% in 1997-98. Thus, the highest percentage of students with disabilities exempted from TAAS testing was at Zavala, which is also the only school where all students with disabilities were included 100% of the time. This percentage is nearly twice the percentages at Dawson and Pillow.

Note that the actual number of students with disabilities taking the TAAS test (see columns 6-11) is smaller than the actual number of students with disabilities at each of these schools. For example, only two Zavala students took the test. Depending on the sub-test, up to 31 students at Brentwood took the test, up to 11 at Dawson, and up to 26 students at Pillow. Excluded students may include those whose Individualized Education Programs did not include academic instruction in the grade level classes.

Table 9: Number of General and Students with Disabilities at Four Schools with Percentages of Students with Disabilities Exempted from TAAS

School	Total Number of Students with disabilities		% of Students with disabilities Exempted from TAAS	
	1993-94	1997-98	1993-94	1997-98
Brentwood	72	87	.16	.15
Dawson	81	94	.51	.32
Pillow	54	73	.17	.34
Zavala	48	57	.67	.60

Of the students with disabilities who were taking the TAAS, only a small number met the requirements for minimal test mastery. However, some students with disabilities did master it. At Brentwood, 9 (10%) of the total number of students with disabilities in the school passed reading, 15 (17%) math and 4 (5%) writing. At Dawson, 8 (9%) passed reading, 11 (12%) math and 4 (4%) writing. At Pillow, 5 (7%) passed reading, 3 (4%) math, and 2 (3%) writing. And, at Zavala, neither of the two students tested mastered any sub-tests. Note that over 9% of the total number of students with disabilities at Brentwood and Dawson passed for both reading and math. These data indicate that some students with disabilities who take the TAAS have mastered it.

Qualitative Responses of Educators Toward Inclusion

When educators from the four schools were interviewed, many of them had additional ideas to share about inclusion and the education of students with special education needs. The educators were willing to be interviewed, often while they were teaching or managing students; they tended to elaborate with ideas and opinions that went beyond the structured interview questions. The interviewer captured these comments in field notes which are included in Appendix F.

The educators' comments were generally positive and reflect acceptance of students with disabilities. Several indicated that they:

- liked having teacher assistants,
- valued the special education teachers and speech pathologists,
- were proud of their programs,
- felt the TAAS scores of general education students were not affected,
- did not like pull-out programs, and
- liked inclusion.

Several also recommended certain practices and policies such as:

- offering more staff development on inclusion,
- offering opportunities to visit schools farther along with inclusion,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- respecting the special challenges presented to the classroom teacher and providing support,
- making the special education assessment process more relative to classroom applications,
- providing better training for teacher assistants,
- catching reading problems earlier, and
- using mainstreaming rather than inclusion with students with more serious emotional problems.

Qualitative Responses of Parents Toward Inclusion

The selection of parents to respond to the parent questionnaire was not systematic. Therefore, no quantitative data were compiled. However, it is instructive to examine the qualitative responses of these parents, detailed in Appendix G. Their attitudes were mixed, but generally positive. A rank ordering of schools by percentage of positive comments about educating students with disabilities in general education resulted in the following: Brentwood (67%), Pillow (56%), Zavala (47%), and Dawson (33%).

Brentwood was the only campus with students with hearing impairments, and these students were very positively received at this school. Also, some classroom teachers at Brentwood received student visitors from the Rosedale campus (a separate special education campus for students with more serious special education needs). Again, parents whose children had access to this program were generally positive about the impact of the program on their own children. However, it is important to remember that Brentwood and Dawson have the most students spending the most amount of time in special education.

At Dawson, only two students were included (100% time) in the general education program, so the parents were less aware of inclusion, as evidenced by some of the comments reflecting less support of students with disabilities and expressions of more fears than in the other three schools. (For examples, refer to Appendix G). It is important to note that Dawson had the longest history of educating students with more seriously challenging special education needs and busing students with disabilities from other neighborhoods to their campus. They also reported having very positive relationships with both special and general education parents. Thus, it may be more difficult for this campus to make a shift toward inclusion, although the data in Table 3 indicate they are moving in that direction (with 17% of students with disabilities in the general classes 76% of the time or more).

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The interview method was well-received at all four schools. Nearly all respondents expressed pleasure in being asked what they thought about inclusion of students with disabilities in general education programs. Generally, they were positive about educating students with disabilities in general education settings. They were conservative about how to best do this, with many of them preferring to have the included students accompanied by a special education teacher or teacher assistant or continuing to have resource room services. Nearly everyone favored using teacher assistants to help all students in a class, not just the students with

disabilities. In all four schools, most of these educators seem to feel positively about working together collaboratively.

It is recommended that all staff be guided to explore two more service delivery options in addition to using only resource services or cooperative teaching. (Cooperative teaching is when the special education teacher teaches the students with disabilities in the grade-level classroom.) Two other viable options are consulting teaching and some form of teacher assistance teams. Consulting teaching is where the special education teacher meets with and plans for special education modifications with the classroom teacher, but does not work directly with students, except for assessment and intervention experimentation. Some special education teachers at each of the four schools used cooperative teaching with some of the classroom teachers. Teacher assistance teams are teams of teachers that help classroom teachers plan modifications for special education and at-risk students. The principal at Dawson discussed exploring this option in the future. [More in-depth explanations of these options can be found in Idol (1997).[2]]

As to which of the four service delivery options to use, it depends on the individual student and his or her needs. For some students, the less restrictive and consultative approaches, such as consulting teaching and teacher assistance, are sufficient. For other students, the more direct teacher services such as cooperative teaching and provision of instructional assistants are the better options. A well designed, campus plan should include appropriate utilization of all four options is mainstreaming and inclusion are going to be used. If the faculty is ready to move to inclusion exclusively, with no mainstreaming, then a combination of consulting teaching, cooperative teaching, and appropriate use of instructional assistants is the better solution. The reader is reminded that some schools do use only consulting teaching and instructional assistants.

Many educators still prefer the resource room model because they believe the only way to help a student with disabilities is to remove them from the general education classroom for tutorial assistance. It is recommended that school faculties examine closely the special education efficacy data for resource room service delivery. Some studies show equitable performance in general education classes; some show minimal or no change in academic performance; others show positive results. The reader is referred to Part 1 of this report for a review of the research on special education service delivery and to a more in-depth review in Idol (1993).[3] At best, when resource rooms are used, they should be supportive resource rooms where the curriculum matches and/or supports that used in the general education program and where the resource room teacher and the classroom teacher work together in planning and monitoring the student's entire academic program. These two collaborating teachers should develop a plan to include the student with disabilities in the general classroom program as soon as is feasible.

Only two of the 120 educators interviewed favored self-contained classes as their first choice for optional special education service delivery. Yet, in these four schools, there are several self-contained classes. It is recommended that this discrepancy be carefully considered. Perhaps some of the students in these classes could be educated just as well in a less restrictive learning environment.

---

[2] Idol, L. (1997). Creating collaborative and inclusive schools. Austin, TX: Eitel Press.
[3] Idol, L. (1993). Special educator's consultation handbook (2nd Ed.). Austin, TX: PRO-ED.

Results from this study indicate that special education programming depends on the type of disabilities. Inclusion of students with more serious behavioral and emotional problems appears to be the more difficult to accomplish. For example, at Pillow in classes where mainstreaming was occurring the special education teachers, teacher assistants, and classroom teachers wear beepers so the classroom teacher can quickly call for assistance if student behavior becomes disruptive.

Another point to consider is whether to reassign all students with disabilities to their neighborhood schools. This would reduce the number of highly disruptive students on a single campus. It would also make it considerably easier to include a smaller number of students with mild retardation in various classes. The students with disabilities could become more a part of their schools and student with mild disabilities might be noticed less for their differences.

The educators interviewed for this report indicated that more staff development related to inclusion is needed. The staff development topics should include making appropriate instructional and curricular modifications. Also, more information and training should be made available on how to effectively support teachers of inclusive classrooms in a variety of ways, including: consulting teaching, cooperative teaching, teacher assistants, and teacher assistance teams. The schools studied for this report appear to be utilizing the teacher assistants very well. Some of these educators have also indicated that more staff development is needed for the teacher assistants. Some educators who prefer the more traditional methods (i.e., pull-out service delivery) might benefit from visiting schools where inclusion is practiced.

Most educators indicated they were utilizing good classroom management and student discipline strategies. Some indicated they needed to improve in this area. Based on the evaluator's experience as a inclusion consultant to schools, staff development should be offered with particular focus on using the same sound disciplinary practices regardless of whether the student is a student with disabilities or one who is at risk for school failure. Also, staff development is needed in the areas of use of cooperative, heterogeneous learning groups. Good examples of cooperative learning groups can be found at Brentwood in the multi-level classes. Use of reading tutor programs is another area (in the opinion of this consultant) that has helped some other schools, which are heavily dependent on the resource room model, to move to developing more inclusive classrooms. The reading tutorial program in the library at Zavala is an example of this.

As teachers move to using more inclusive classrooms, they often discover that many of the same strategies that work with students who are at risk for school failure also work for certain students with disabilities, and vice versa. This practice was evident in several classrooms across the four schools. As schools move in this direction, it is important to monitor how many other students in a classroom are benefiting from strategies the special education consulting teacher and the classroom teacher developed for a student with disabilities. These data could help support the efficacy of using the consulting teacher approach, in that certain other students who are experiencing failure are expected to benefit from the same strategies developed for the student with disabilities. There is evidence of this happening at Zavala, in particular, because they have a consulting teacher; but examples of it can be found at each of the other three schools as well. Often this happens in mainstreamed classes and with special education teachers who consult informally with classroom teachers even though it is not a formal part of their job. This

is an indicator that consulting teaching is a viable option and could be more formally utilized. This is particularly so because exclusive use of cooperative teaching limits the special educator to only working in a limited number of classrooms due to time constraints.

In general, the administrators in these four schools are doing a good job of working with and supporting the teachers, as evidenced by the teachers' perception of them. For many schools, teachers' perception of lack of principal support is the primary reason why change, in particular movement to inclusion, does not take place. Many teachers viewed their principal as being supportive of them and as being an instructional leader. In schools where this is not the case, staff development and support of principals in assuming the instructional leadership role could be beneficial.

Instructional leadership is tied to supporting faculties in making changes, especially those related to curriculum and instruction. In addition, the attitudes of the administrators in this study were strongly in favor of inclusion of students with disabilities; to some degree they were more supportive than some of the teachers. Although, most teachers viewed the general education experience for students with disabilities as being both viable and positive. The attitudes of these educators toward students with disabilities was strongly positive in all four schools.

One of the biggest concerns of many educators in Texas is the possible adverse effect the presence of students with disabilities in the classroom might have on the TAAS performance of other students. In this study, most of the teachers did not think this was the case, although some did. The data over a four-year period of time indicate that all four of these schools have improved the TAAS test performances of the students at their schools. It is recommended that the TAAS data for students with disabilities be examined and reported separately from the general education students at the local level. Compiled data for all students taking the TAAS test may have to be reported at the state level, but within the district these data could be separated into two categories (general education and special education), monitored, and reported back to the campuses. This practice will encourage classroom teachers to open their classroom doors to students with disabilities since it is likely their class average scores will not be lowered. Also, more of the students with disabilities should be given the opportunity to prepare for and be given the TAAS test. Over time, some students may be able to master the TAAS test and this practice could result in teachers' having higher expectations for certain students with disabilities.

As a movement is made to developing more inclusive schools, it is important to monitor the referrals to special education. Initially, referrals may increase because teachers who are new to inclusion may be overly concerned about having students with disabilities in their classes. As they become more accustomed to teaching students at various performance levels, the referrals should decline, particularly if the roles of the special education teachers are re-conceptualized to give maximum support to the classroom teacher.

It would also be helpful to examine how speech/language services are offered. Some of this instruction, particularly language intervention, could be offered in the general education program with the speech/language therapist serving as a consulting teacher.

For schools in the district that are in the beginning stages of exploring inclusion, it is instructive to follow the example set at Pillow. At this school, decisions to include a student with disabilities in general education are made on a child-by-child basis. For schools that are

farther along, the total inclusion approach, as exemplified at Zavala, would be a good model to follow. As teachers have more practice using inclusion their acceptance and tolerance of students with disabilities in their classes seems to improve. They also become more skilled in delivering lessons that accommodate students at various levels of learning and performance.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Principal and Assistant Principal Interview Data
Special Education Service Delivery
AISD

Name _____**School** _____ **Date**_____

Years as Principal at this School _____ **Total Years Principal Experience** ____

Total Years of Teaching Experience prior to Principalship _____

Years of Formal Education _____**Total Hours Inservice on Inclusion** _____

Principals' Perceptions of Change

1. In the past, the way(s) I have given support to the special education program has been:

2. In this current year, the way(s) I have given support to the special education program has been:

3. In the past, the way(s) I have given support to the classroom teachers who include special education students has been:

4. In this current year, the way(s) I have given support to the classroom teachers who include special education students has been:

5. Indicate your attitude of toward inclusion:

1 = Very much in favor
2 = Willing to accept it and try it
3 = Willing to accept it if others do it
4 = It isnít appropriate

___Last year, March 1997
___This year, March 1998

6. Indicate your attitude toward students with handicapping conditions:

1 = Very supportive
2 = Willing to accept them in my classroom
3 = Willing to accept these students if other teachers take responsibility for them
4 = Not supportive of their attendance in public schools

___Last year, March 1997
___This year, March 1998

7. Indicate your attitude toward working collaboratively with your faculty:

1 = Others view me as a good collaborator
2 = I work with most teachers
3 = I would be willing to work with more teachers
4 = I prefer for them to work together
5 = I prefer for them to work independently

___Last year, March 1997
___This year, March 1998

8. In general, I believe students with special education needs are best educated:

___ in their grade level classroom
___ in their grade level classroom with the special education teacher or assistant in the classroom with them
___in their grade level classroom with supportive resource services
___mainstreamed with part-time in the regular class and part-time in special education class
___in self-contained, special education classes
___on separate, special education campuses

9. When students with special education needs are taught in their grade level classes, they are best taught by (select only your first choice):

___including them with all students and having all available adults work with any student needing assistance.
___having them work with an instructional assistant.
___having them work with the special educator

10. The sources of monies we use to support the special education program include:

___allocations of special education teachers____how many?
___allocations of special education Teacher Assistants___how many?
___$100 per special education staff received from district special education office
___cross-funding with Title 1
___cross-funding with bilingual education
___grant
___school adopters
___other

11. What is the ratio of students:teacher?

___Pre-K ___Kinder ___1st ___2nd ___3rd
___4th ___5th

APPENDIX B

Classroom Teacher Interview Data
Special Education Service Delivery
AISD

Name _____ **Grade Level** _____ **Date** _____

School _____ **Total Years Teaching Experience** _____

Years of Formal Education _____**Total Hours Inservice on Inclusion** _____

Number of Students in Your Class _____

Teachers' Perceptions of Change

Please rate your skills in each of the following areas using this rating scale:

1 = I am very skilled and could or do teach this skill to others
2 = I apply this skill in my work
3 = I am currently practicing this skill
4 = I need more information about this skill

1. adapting/modifying classroom instruction for students
   ____with special education needs.
   ____who are at risk for school failure.

2. adapting/modifying classroom curriculum for students
   ____with special education needs.
   ____who are at risk for school failure.

3. discipline and student management for students
   ____with special education needs.
   ____who are at risk for school failure.

4. Indicate your attitude of toward inclusion:

1 = Very much in favor
2 = Willing to accept it and try it
3 = Willing to accept it if others do it
4 = It isn't appropriate

___Last year, March 1997

__This year, March 1998

5. Indicate your attitude toward students with handicapping conditions:

1 = Very supportive
2 = Willing to accept them in my classroom
3 = Willing to accept these students if other teachers take responsibility for them
4 = Not supportive of their attendance in public schools

__Last year, March 1997
__This year, March 1998

6. Indicate your attitude toward working collaboratively with other teachers.

1 = Others view me as a good collaborator
2 = I work with other teachers
3 = I would be willing to work with other teachers
4 = I prefer to work alone

__Last year, March 1997
__This year, March 1998

7. In general, I believe students with special education needs are best educated:

___ in their grade level classroom
___ in their grade level classroom with the special education teacher or assistant in the classroom with them
___in their grade level classroom with supportive resource services
___mainstreamed with part-time in the regular class and part-time in special education class
___in self-contained, special education classes
___on separate, special education campuses

8. When students with special education needs are taught in their grade level classes, they are best taught by (select only your first choice):

___including them with all students and having all available adults work with any student needing assistance.
___having them work with an instructional assistant.
___having them work with the special educator

9. Regarding inclusion, I believe our principal is:

___very supportive of inclusion
___somewhat supportive of inclusion
___not supportive of inclusion

10. Regarding how supportive our principal is of me as a professional in this building he or she is:

___very supportive
___somewhat supportive
___not supportive

11. I view our principal as:

___an instructional leader
___an administrative manager
___both of the above

Answer the following if you have students with special education needs included in your class:

Changes in Your Students

1. When special education students are included in your class, what is the impact on each of the following on the other students in the class:
   1 = improved
   2 = about the same as before they were included
   3 = worse

   ___ student academic skills?
   ___ grades?
   ___ TAAS scores?
   ___ student social behaviors?
   ___ student attitude toward students with handicaps?
   ___ student attitudes toward inclusion?
   ___ parental attitudes toward inclusion?
2. Identify special education students who have been included in your class. For each, indicate how many other students experiencing difficulties have also been helped as a result of the inclusion effort.

Student _____Disabilities _____

# of other benefiting students____ Grade ___

APPENDIX C

Special Education Teacher Interview Data
Special Education Service Delivery
AISD

Name _____ **Date** _____**Grade Levels Served** _____

Type of Special Education Program You Have _____

School _____ **Total Years Teaching Experience** _____

Years of Formal Education _____**Total Hours Inservice on Inclusion** _____

Number of Students You Serve ____

Teachers' Perceptions of Change

Please rate your skills in each of the following areas using this rating scale:

1 = I am very skilled and could or do teach this skill to others
2 = I apply this skill in my work
3 = I am currently practicing this skill
4 = I need more information about this skill

1. adapting/modifying classroom instruction for students
   ____with special education needs.
   ____who are at risk for school failure.

2. adapting/modifying classroom curriculum for students
   ____with special education needs.
   ____who are at risk for school failure.

3. discipline and student management for students
   ____with special education needs.
   ____who are at risk for school failure.

4. Indicate your attitude of toward inclusion:

1 = Very much in favor
2 = Willing to accept it and try it
3 = Willing to accept it if others do it
4 = It isnít appropriate

___Last year, March 1997
___This year, March 1998

5. Indicate your attitude toward students with handicapping conditions:

1 = Very supportive
2 = Willing to accept them in my classroom
3 = Willing to accept these students if other teachers take responsibility for them
4 = Not supportive of their attendance in public schools

___Last year, March 1997
___This year, March 1998

6. Indicate your attitude toward working collaboratively with other teachers.

1 = Others view me as a good collaborator
2 = I work with other teachers
3 = I would be willing to work with other teachers
4 = I prefer to work alone

___Last year, March 1997
___This year, March 1998

7. In general, I believe students with special education needs are best educated:

___ in their grade level classroom
___ in their grade level classroom with the special education teacher or assistant in the classroom with them
___in their grade level classroom with supportive resource services
___mainstreamed with part-time in the regular class and part-time in special education class
___in self-contained, special education classes
___on separate, special education campuses

8. When students with special education needs are taught in their grade level classes, they are best taught by (select only your first choice):

___including them with all students and having all available adults work with any student needing assistance.
___having them work with an instructional assistant.
___having them work with the special educator

9. Regarding inclusion, I believe our principal is:

___very supportive of inclusion
___somewhat supportive of inclusion
___not supportive of inclusion

10. Regarding how supportive our principal is of me as a professional in this building he or she is:

___very supportive
___somewhat supportive
___not supportive

11. I view our principal as:

___an instructional leader
___an administrative manager
___both of the above

12. My role as a special educator is best described as:

____consulting teacher (consult with teachers)
____cooperative teacher (co-teach in general education)
____supportive resource teacher (using general education curriculum)
____resource teacher (use a variety of curriculum)
____ self-contained special class teacher

Answer the following if you have students with special education needs who are included in regular education 100 % of the time:

Changes in Your Students

1. When special education students are included in regular education, what is the impact on each of the following on the other students in the class:
   1 = improved
   2 = about the same as before they were included
   3 = worse

   ___ student academic skills?
   ___ grades?
   ___ TAAS scores?

___ student social behaviors?
___ student attitude toward students with handicaps?
___ student attitudes toward inclusion?
___ parental attitudes toward inclusion?

2. Identify special education students who have been included. For each, indicate how many other students experiencing difficulties have also been helped as a result of the inclusion effort.

Student _____Disabilities _____

# of other benefiting students____ Grade ___

Student _____Disabilities _____

# of other benefiting students____ Grade ___

Student _____Disabilities _____

# of other benefiting students____ Grade ___

Student _____Disabilities _____

# of other benefiting students____ Grade ___

Student _____Disabilities _____

# of other benefiting students____ Grade ___

Student _____Disabilities _____

# of other benefiting students____ Grade ___

Student _____Disabilities _____

# of other benefiting students____ Grade ___

Student _____Disabilities _____

# of other benefiting students____ Grade ___

APPENDIX D

Teacher Assistants' Interview Data
Special Education Service Delivery
AISD

Name _____ **Date** _____**Grade Levels Served** _____

Type of Program You Are Assigned To _____

School _____ **Total Years Assistant Experience** _____

Years of Formal Education _____**Total Hours Inservice on Inclusion** _____

Number of Students You Serve ____

Teacher Assistants' Perceptions of Change

Please rate your skills in each of the following areas using this rating scale:

1 = I am very skilled and could or do teach this skill to others
2 = I apply this skill in my work
3 = I am currently practicing this skill
4 = I need more information about this skill

1. adapting/modifying classroom instruction for students
   ____with special education needs.
   ____who are at risk for school failure.

2. adapting/modifying classroom curriculum for students
   ____with special education needs.
   ____who are at risk for school failure.

3. discipline and student management for students
   ____with special education needs.
   ____who are at risk for school failure.

4. Indicate your attitude of toward inclusion:

1 = Very much in favor
2 = Willing to accept it and try it
3 = Willing to accept it if others do it
4 = It isnít appropriate

___Last year, March 1997
___This year, March 1998

5. Indicate your attitude toward students with handicapping conditions:

1 = Very supportive
2 = Willing to accept them
3 = Willing to accept these students if teachers take responsibility for them
4 = Not supportive of their attendance in public schools

___Last year, March 1997
___This year, March 1998

6. Indicate your attitude toward working collaboratively with teachers.

1 = Others view me as a good collaborator
2 = I work with teachers
3 = I would be willing to work with more teachers
4 = I prefer to work alone

___Last year, March 1997
___This year, March 1998

7. In general, I believe students with special education needs are best educated:

___ in their grade level classroom
___ in their grade level classroom with the special education teacher or assistant in the classroom with them
___in their grade level classroom with supportive resource services
___mainstreamed with part-time in the regular class and part-time in special education class
___in self-contained, special education classes
___on separate, special education campuses

8. When students with special education needs are taught in their grade level classes, they are best taught by (select only your first choice):

___including them with all students and having all available adults work with any student needing assistance.
___having them work with an instructional assistant.
___having them work with the special educator

9. Regarding inclusion, I believe our principal is:

___very supportive of inclusion
___somewhat supportive of inclusion
___not supportive of inclusion

10. Regarding how supportive our principal is of me as an instructional assistant in this building he or she is:

___very supportive
___somewhat supportive
___not supportive

11. I view our principal as:

___an instructional leader
___an administrative manager
___both of the above

12. My role as an instructional assistant educator is best described as:

____assistant to the special education teacher
____assistant to classroom teachers
____tutor for 1:1 instruction
____prepare instructional materials
____ other _____

Answer the following if you assist students with special education needs who are included in regular education 100 % of the time:

Changes in Your Students

1. When special education students are included in regular education, what is the impact on each of the following on the other students in the class:
   1 = improved
   2 = about the same as before they were included
   3 = worse

   ___ student academic skills?
   ___ grades?
   ___ TAAS scores?

___ student social behaviors?
___ student attitude toward students with handicaps?
___ student attitudes toward inclusion?
___ parental attitudes toward inclusion?

2. Identify special education students who have been included. For each, indicate how many other students experiencing difficulties have also been helped as a result of the inclusion effort.

Student _____Disabilities _____

# of other benefiting students____ Grade ___

Student _____Disabilities _____

# of other benefiting students____ Grade ___

Student _____Disabilities _____

# of other benefiting students____ Grade ___

Student _____Disabilities _____

# of other benefiting students____ Grade ___

Student _____Disabilities _____

# of other benefiting students____ Grade ___

Student _____Disabilities _____

# of other benefiting students____ Grade ___

Student _____Disabilities _____

# of other benefiting students____ Grade ___

Student _____Disabilities _____

# of other benefiting students____

APPENDIX E

Parent Interview

Name _____ **Date**_____ **Grade in School**_____

Child's Name _____ _____ **School**_____

1. What is your reaction to having students with special education needs in the grade level classes?

   ___very positive
   ___somewhat positive
   ___neutral
   ___somewhat negative
   ___very negative

2. Have you observed in changes in your child's attitudes toward students with special education needs?

3. Where do you believe students with special education are best educated?
   ___the grade level class along with other students.
   ___in separate classes in the same school.
   ___in separate schools.

4. When your child's class became an inclusive classroom, what were your initial fears?

5. How have your fears changed?

6. What do you believe the impact of inclusion has been on your child?

7. What do you believe the impact of inclusion has been on other students in your childís class?

APPENDIX F

Educators' Qualitative Responses

Stem: What else would you like us to know?

Brentwood

Art Teacher
I was fearful at first. We didn't know how. More training is always beneficial. There has been plenty. Maybe all teachers should be certified in special education, like all have 30 hr. in gifted and talented. There are differing opinions here about the multi-age classes. Our staff is divided.

Classroom Teachers
With my background at Easter Seals, it is good to see kids included and not separated. I share with Pre-K and the hearing impairment program. That teacher shares equipment with me. He shares whatever will help me down the road.

We're working hard to pass TAAS. I put a lot of effort and I'm very pleased with reading and drastic improvements in math (*5th grade teacher of 29 years*)

They need to consider the type of handicap. With ED and BD kids it's sometimes not helpful to the other kids. These kids would benefit from being in a special education class. The students with LD benefit by being in the regular class. We need more criteria for how they are placed. We also need more BD units. The self-contained grade level classes (not the multi-age classes) have more special education kids. Last year I had 22 2nd graders with 8 special education students. The first year I had 13 students with special problems. The included students should be distributed across classes.

In the multi-age classes, we do cooperative teaching, teaming, multiple intelligences; we check a lot for understanding and reflection. This is a good place for inclusion. I wish for teaching investigations (Math Discovery program) I had another person to help students through the process. We can send students down to the resource room for reading and witing, but not for Discovery Math. You do this with the whole group.

The ED staff are very good and supportive. They don't question us if we see it's not working. They always come to check.

A big factor is struggling with a variety of levels within the ESL group of students. There are 12 in our multi-age class (shared 4/5 grade). One student is mono-lingual, 5 are dominant in Spanish, plus 6 more. I would like to see what the other schools do with bilingual and inclusion.

I've been doing inclusion for a long time (11 years). The main modifications I use are shorter assignments, vocabulary lists, using the content mastery resource program (for the last 5 years). For kids with severe LD, inclusion may not work because of behavior problems. If they are included, you need to have a TA or another adult in the class. I feel these kids need to be included. But, the kids with BD need to be separate sometimes.

The kids from Rosedale have been very good for my class. For the past 4 years I have had students with hearing impairments, but none for this year. I miss these kids. The other kids

benefit from what I did with them. The sound system that comes with them is awesome!

We have seen that it works and I really like team teaching with the resource teacher. I always wanted to do that.

We like inclusion! We treat the Rosedale students well. Both boys and girls like to be with them. It is so sweet. The parents' attitudes have changes. This is natural for kids. We only had problems with one regular education child being accepting. He had his own problems and was obsessive/compulsive.

I think inclusion is great. My nephew has CP and I want him to be in regular class, as much as possible. All kids have that right. More training is needed especially for new teachers to learn the most effective way. Last year I had a student with hearing impairment and behavior problems. It was challenging but I was willing. I just didn't know how to do it. I used lots of shared activities. The special education teacher wanted him included mostly for developing social skills.

My main concerns are we need Teacher Assistants and training.

It is a big issue with AISD about the assistants. They say they don't have money for them. But, they want you to do inclusion. They won't even let us write that a student needs an aide on the IEP because then they would have to provide the aide. If the parents are demanding then we are more likely to get the children with maybe an aide. This year I did get an aide because one was not potty trained and one would always try to run away. The quality of the aides is sometimes not good.

We have a professional on our staff in a wheelchair. At her last school, the principal was hostile toward her.

We need to have a bilingual speech therapist for several kids. It doesn't mean I want to get rid of the speech therapist we have. The problem is our school is not low enough to qualify for Chapter 1 and our numbers (of students) are lower.

Special Education Teachers
I' m for it but there for some kids it will be very difficult, especially if they don't have listening and language skills. Yet, they need to be around their peers. It's easier as they get older.

My concern about inclusion is that it is change for the sake of change. This is my first year back with the District after many years away. 25 years ago it was the same issue and no one has resolved it. It has been an ongoing debate. As with all issues in education, it seems to fall into a continual cycle of change without thoroughly looking into the fact that it's not good for all special education students. They are not considering the type of handicap and the child. They make a blanket decision and all these kids who don't fit are lost. That's very distressing to me. For some students with hearing impairment it works beautifully, but if a blanket policy is used, unless the District is happy, sound, and willing to provide special education teacher support to the (classroom teachers) the children will suffer. Even on an individual campus, it's all one way or not. Cooperative teaching is wonderful. It's idealistic.

This is a good school for working with special education. They are willing to let you come into their classrooms. For me, only one teacher said, "No. I didn't push the issue."

Some kids in the self-contained program (BD) would really like mainstreaming or full inclusion. One of mine went to Dill. We have 2 adults in our Unit. An adult can't stay in the Unit alone with these kids. So, both me and my aide have to be here. Then, there is no one to go with the kids to the regular classroom or to be available for emergencies with these kids in the classroom. We need another person for safety. The multi-age classes cuts back on my choices because these classes are much bigger. There is more energy and less structured teaching styles. The self-contained (regular education) classes are full of other district special education children, plus the personalities of the various teachers.

Counselor
I am on a District task force. There is no consistency with delivery of special education across the district. Some have class within a class, some have content mastery. Others are only pull out.

Teacher Assistants
It works if you get the right combination, i.e., the personalities of the teachers. One student made it because her special education teacher was her cheerleader. In the inclusive classroom they have personal peer feedback and better role models. When a special education student first comes to the inclusive classroom they are viewed as behaving inappropriately because they are talking a lot . But, really they are new to this social group. They are "the odd man out" and it takes awhile for them to be a part of the group.

Art Teacher
I was fearful at first. We didn't know how. More training is <u>always</u> beneficial. There has been plenty. Maybe all teachers should be certified in special education like they all had to have 30 hours in gifted and talented. Our staff is divided; there are differing opinions about the multi-age classes.

<u>Dawson</u>

Classroom Teachers
I work well with them. One third of my class is special education. Before I did a class within a class with another teacher. I loved it! It was great for all kids. The first year it was her kids/my kids. The second year it was "our kids." The TAAS score were the same. The special education students told their parents they were no longer in special education. There are benefits for everyone. Like ice skating, the whole class was helpers. It was frustrating to go back to resource model and the scheduling problems.

I really don't like pull-out programs. You lose time and waste time with pull-out. I pretend they are all on grade level. I treat them all the same. I expect as much—not less. For example, one child missed ½ the TAAS items before, now he only missed ¼ of them. I like them to stay with me.

I need help! I'm sure they would help me. It should be more organized, planned out. This child was just thrown in here. I'm torn, when should I send him for support? What are the guidelines for learning resource? There is another kid. His reading hasn't improved that much. Is this really a good reading program?? Resource is separate from us. We should be together. The principal pushes this. The special education team and grade level team don't get it. I wish there was more open mindedness. I feel responsible for these two kids for TAAS.

It's basically the same here as it was 9 years ago, but the children's attitudes toward special education have improved. The teachers are more accepting. *(from a teacher who had left for awhile and come back)*

I want to learn more about inclusion. I want to go to workshops.

Special education and regular education balance each other out. The gifted children? Some are sympathetic to the disability; some are arrogant; some help out. It's good for the other kids to see the motivational level of the students with disabilities. The more I learn the better my instruction gets.

I take the kids as they are. I'm for it. I'd like to try it before I retire, but you're running out of time. *(a teacher of 28 years)*

Dawson has good inclusion. The special education kids are really well-accepted. As an example, I have a third grade girl with autism who came for centers. Her needs were met.

Pillow

Classroom Teachers
It would be terrible to go back to an isolation school. For the special education students, both social skills and academics are improved. It would be better if we had more people and support. This would take care of my concerns. Before I came to Pillow, it scared me to death. It's not the frightening thing I thought it would be.

Our special education staff are very supportive/wonderful! Even with non-special education students they give ideas and support. I team teach with the Project Read teacher every day. And, we have a small group math lab that is really supportive. That's why inclusion is so well-received because special education is good.

Inclusion has gone over well in our school. I'd like to see the special education kids more evenly distributed across the district. I like the special education unit.

We appreciate being asked.

The organization of inclusion is hazy and unclear. We need more communication at the beginning of the year between the classroom teacher and the special education teacher for the new special education student. Then, I could be more aware of how to maximize instruction for that child. Before we had Content Mastery Lab for at-risk students. It helped students at-risk. It was another support net. We don't have it now. Our special education contact teacher favors pull-out, resource room.

Inclusion is a good thing. They benefit from being in the classroom. I just don't have the answers. To keep teaching the same thing in the resource room isn't good. It's better to be with a group and pull it out of them. If it didn't work for 2 years in special education, it won't work. Special education teachers need more training in how to do group work. They get too used to slow progress.

Special Education Teachers
It worked so much better than I ever dreamed. I never realized the impact it would have on my kids, especially for self-concepts and attitudes. No one can believe my kids are handicapped. That's what I want. It has allowed me to do. It has taken the negative stigma of self-contained away. Today you practice not wait until you can go out. The kids used to blame the system. Now, I can say it's there for you...the door is open.

I'm in favor. I like it. I like having some kind of a fall back like resource and content mastery (a back-up plan). That's what makes it work for me.

Teacher Assistants
We keep finding new ways to make things better because it really works. I'm impressed with it. The regular education teachers are super! We got an A-1 program. It works every time.

Zavala

Classroom Teachers
I'm not the biggest fan of inclusion. I haven't taught that long. Inclusion presents special challenges. Experienced teachers make it look easy, but I'm not impressed. They are really giving the kids the answers.

Now, the kids are the extra helpers rather than saying, "How come he gets more help?
The University needs more training for teachers on special education inclusion. These kids are thrown in the pool! They didn't want to go to resource. They didn't want to lose out. The teachers were more receptive after inclusion came. It's not the easiest thing to do.

I like the idea of inclusion. I came from a pull-out school. Not stigmatizing special education is the most important idea behind inclusion. The expectation for succeeding should always be there, even with modifications. When I had special education students, I found they were capable of working on grade level. Inclusion is a good idea but it has to be done right.

Good things come out of the testing process. If testing could focus on the gaps it would be better. I want to know the exact nature of the learning disability and how to best focus on that disability. They are categorized by the testing. I want to know more information. I want to know how to help a third grader at first grade level who comes to school defeated...how to best meet that child's needs. Is it practical to go back to first (grade)? Knowing what I know, that's not the answer. There is an assumption that because we have inclusion they're not getting what they need. They're special education, we don't have to give them the best.

I'm a second year teacher. I believe the concept of inclusion is good. It needs to be followed through by training the teachers to be specialists. The Teacher Assistants need to be highly trained. We're in the very beginning steps of being a model school for inclusion. Right now, it's tough without a lot of training. I believe in inclusion when it is practical. It's ideal. When it is not, the kids miss out on extra help they need. Inclusion has a tendency to wear teachers a little thin. It affects the whole class. Before inclusion, teachers must be trained well and understand it.

I have faith in inclusion. The concept is good. It needs to be heavily supported. It fell through in the first year. I had an assistant only the first year. The assistants need to be trained in special

education.

First graders are first graders. Class size shouldn't be an issue for inclusion. All first graders need the instructional assistant. I wish our inclusion teacher could come in more often. She's wonderful! The Teacher Assistants aren't all the same. One special

education child is more comfortable with the special education teacher than with me. She works with her and the child tries harder for her.
Inclusion is definitely what we should do. Resource rooms don't work. We need more support; another person in the class.

I really think the assistants are not trained in special education. They are just people from the neighborhood. The teachers need more training. Three to four years ago, that was really the case for us. In our school, there is no special education support in the early grades. They don't know how to identify these kids in the early grades.

This district is really into gifted and diversified learning styles. We need to address both ends, as early childhood teacher, I would like staff development on challenging children. The children need to be identified earlier. If you have a gut feeling that a child needs help, we need to help now not wait until they are in third grade. I don't identify one a year. I don't use it as an excuse to get active children out.

Even in regular education we need help and support. Right now, more of them need special help but later on they need help for reading. It's too early to catch the academic problems; we catch speech. We need an extra adult in the class.

The special education teacher and the speech teacher are very good. They do an exceptional job. They've done inservice for us. They keep us on target. They've also done so for the district. " We hopped on the inclusion bandwagon from the get go." It would be nice to have assistants at the Pre-K and Kinder, but especially at the 1st and 2nd grade.

APPENDIX G

Parental Interview Data on Inclusion: Brentwood Elementary School

Grade Level of Child: Parent #1: Pre-K; Parent #2: Multi-age 1st/2nd; Parent #3: 2nd; Parent #4: 2nd; Parent #5: 5th; Parent #6: 5th

1. What is your reaction to having students with special education needs in the grade level classes?
   - **4 parents** Very positive
   - **1 parent** Somewhat positive
   - **1 parent** Don't know (PreK parent)

2. Have you observed changes in your child's attitudes toward students with special education needs?
   - Parent #1: My son is distracted. A couple of kids require more attention. The teacher has no help with bilingual.
   - Parent #2: Good, with the Rosedale students. My son has always been with hearing impaired students. He doesn't treat them differently.
   - Parent #3: He's always been open and supportive of all kinds of children.
   - Parent #4: We have always taught our son that people come in all sorts of 'packages.' I think perhaps this concept is reinforced by inclusion.
   - Parent #5: Yes! Good, especially when he was in the class with Rosedale students. It made a tremendous difference for him.
   - Parent #6: Yes, especially after he came into contact with children from Rosedale.

3. Where do you believe students with special education needs are best educated?
   - **6 parents** in grade level classes with other students
     or
   - **3 parents** in separate classes in the same school

4. When your child's class became an inclusive classroom, what were your initial fears?
   - Parent #1: It hasn't happened yet. My son's in Pre-K.
   - Parent #2: None.
   - Parent #3: I was unsure the classroom teacher would get the support and time needed to meet the needs of ALL the children in the classroom.
   - Parent #4: None. I would be concerned if a special needs child could not be accommodated without changing the goals of the entire class. I would not want other children to "suffer" for the benefit of one child, who perhaps couldn't listen through instructions or was disruptive to the entire class.
   - Parent #5: I'm very happy it happened. My son has been with them in every grade.
   - Parent #6: None.

5. Have your fears changed?
   - Parent #1: None.
   - Parent #2: None.

Parent #3: Only a dedicated and motivated teacher with parent support will be able to meet the diverse needs of the children in the classroom. We have always had this.
Parent #4: They haven't changed.
Parent #5: None.
Parent #6: None.

6. What do you believe the impact of inclusion has been on your child?
Parent #1: It takes away academically. I don't want academics to be hurt. It shouldn't take took much of the teacher's time.
Parent #2: He'll accept people with handicaps easily.
Parent #3: Inclusion of hearing impaired students has been my child's only experience, although he has had visits from Rosedale students every year.
Parent #4: It has educated him on the specific needs of specific people (e.g. Deaf or hearing impaired people need for you to look directly at them when speaking).
Parent #5: It has made him a lot more aware of difficulties people have in school. It's been excellent!
Parent #6: It has taught my child to value aspects of people that he never thought about before.

7. What do you believe the impact of inclusion has been on other students in your child's class?
Parent #1: The bilingual students aren't learning as quickly because of other kids. For this class, it's a great opportunity to learn about each other.
Parent #2: About the same as my child. They'll accept handicaps more easily.
Parent #3: It's a tremendous amount of work for the teacher(s) which requires support from faculty, administration & parents. My son is respectful of differences in others. The practice of Life Skills and Life-Long Guidelines at Brentwood has had a very positive impact.
Parent #4: I don't feel able to speak for other people.
Parent #5: I think it's good for all the kids. I was here when it was just pull out. The special education kids hated it! They love it with Content Mastery and being with the other kids.
Parent #6: I think it has been a positive experience for all children in his class, even if there was some fear at first.

Parental Interview Data on Inclusion: Dawson Elementary School

Note: This school sent out 50 questionnaires; 15 were returned.

Grade Level of Child:

Parent #1: PreK	Parent #6: 2nd	Parent #11: 3rd
Parent #2: Pre-K	Parent #7: 2nd	Parent #12: 3rd
Parent #3: Pre-K	Parent #8: 2nd	Parent #13: 3rd
Parent #4: Pre-K	Parent #9: 2nd	Parent #14: 4th
Parent #5: Pre-K	Parent #10: 3rd	Parent #15: 5th

1. What is your reaction to having students with special education needs in the grade level classes?
   - **7 parents** Very positive
   - **3 parent** Somewhat positive
   - **5 parents** Neutral

2. Have you observed changes in your child's attitudes toward students with special education needs?
   - Parent #1: No, he has never had a problem with this. Perhaps always a bit shy.
   - Parent #2: None.
   - Parent #3: He is more caring and sensitive toward their needs.
   - Parent #4: Have not observed.
   - Parent #5: I haven't really noted any changes. My child doesn't have any students in special education in her classroom.
   - Parent #6: Understands that there are changes in homework or work. He just works harder to accomplish them.
   - Parent #7: None.
   - Parent #8: None.
   - Parent #9: None.
   - Parent #10: None.
   - Parent #11: No, she always has a positive attitude toward all children.
   - Parent #12: No, mother is disabled.
   - Parent #13: She is a very loving, caring child that shows special attention to those with special needs.
   - Parent #14: My child doesn't know the difference between students with special education and students that are not in special education. She thinks everyone is the same.
   - Parent $15: Yes.

3. Where do you believe students with special education needs are best educated?
   - **7 parents** in grade level classes with other students
   - **3 parent** in grade level classes or in separate classes
   - **4 parents** in separate classes in the same school
   - **1 parent** in separate classes or separate schools

4. When your child's class became an inclusive classroom, what were your initial fears?

Parent #1: I didn't know this had happened. My only fear would be that it would slow down his learning.
Parent #2: I think she is too young to understand these feelings.
Parent #3: If the child with special needs has a seizure, how would my child react.
Parent #4: Didn't know it became an inclusive classroom.
Parent #5: I have a child in another school that is in special education because she is slow in learning. She goes to gym and music with a regular class and she is doing OK.
Parent #6: None.
Parent #7: I wasn't aware this was going on in the classrooms. My only fear is that if the teachers are skilled and also prepared for all types of emergencies.
Parent #8: I have no fears about inclusive classrooms because I feel the children become more open minded. However, for the teachers it becomes more difficult to teach.
Parent #9: I have not been notified of any changes including inclusive classrooms.
Parent #10: I was unaware of this.
Parent #11: None; maybe that the class would not run as smoothly, but I don't think this has been a problem.
Parent #12: None.
Parent #13: I had no fears. Because I knew she could excel anywhere and at whatever she was asked to do at whatever level.
Parent #14: I feel sorry for the teachers because they have enough to deal with 25 students and over. They don't have enough time with the students they have already. The main focus on teaching the students to pass TAAS test and having a good foundation on their academic skills. The special education student might be losing out because the teacher is not going to have time to give them the one-on-one attention.
Parent #15: I was not aware his class was an inclusive classroom.

5. Have your fears changed?
   10 parents Not applicable.
   3 parents No fears.
   1 parent Indifferent.
   1 parent The students will not get the attention they might need.

6. What do you believe the impact of inclusion has been on your child?
   7 parents Not applicable.
   2 parents None.
   Parent #6: My child studies harder and takes things very serious in his subjects.
   Parent #8: She became more open minded and aware of special children's needs.
   Parent #11: Positive.
   Parent #13: She has a well-rounded family that loves her for her. No matter what she fails in or excels in.
   Parent #14: None, because she is not aware of differences in special education.
   Parent #15: I think inclusive classes would have a positive impact.

7. What do you believe the impact of inclusion has been on other students in your child's class?
   7 parents Not applicable.

Parent #6:	Not sure.
Parent #7:	It would probably slow down the teaching in classrooms. I think it would be OK if there was an assistant.
Parent #8:	Not sure, but I hope positive.
Parent #11:	Good. I believe this causes all the children to become well-rounded by being around all types of children.
Parent #12:	Unknown.
Parent #13:	My daughter is a good friend to everyone. I feel the teacher makes A LOT of difference on what the child can achieve. If the teacher has a challenging program the child learns to accept the challenges of class work and applies it in everyday life.
Parent #14:	None. I think the main impact will be on the teachers because they will have to give more time for these students.
Parent #15:	Positive for most. Parental attitude will influence this.

Parental Interview Data on Inclusion: Pillow Elementary School

Grade Level of Child: Parent #1: 2nd
Parent #2: 3rd
Parent #3: 4th

1. What is your reaction to having students with special education needs in the grade level classes?
   - **1 parent** Very positive
   - **1 parent** Somewhat positive
   - **1 parent** Neutral

2. Have you observed changes in your child's attitudes toward students with special education needs?
   - Parent #1: No.
   - Parent #2: My child has always been tolerant of children with special needs, but having them in his class has removed some of the curiosity that comes with being involved with handicapped children.
   - Parent #3: He's a little more tolerant than he used to be.

3. Where do you believe students with special education needs are best educated?
   - **2 parents** in grade level classes with other students *
   - **1 parent** in separate classes in the same school

* one parent said except for students who are disruptive

4. When your child's class became an inclusive classroom, what were your initial fears?
   - Parent #1: None. I want my children to meet and respect lots of people. The classroom is a safe place to meet the widest variety of people.
   - Parent #2: My concern is that teachers should not lose instructional time for the regular students because of disruptive special education students. 504 and handicapped students in the classroom are fine as long as they are treated equally with discipline. Zero tolerance!
   - Parent #3: I don't have any.

5. Have your fears changed?
   - Parent #1: I have seen special education students disrupt classes and take more teacher time than I expected to see. But, the benefit of learning that kids with different physical and emotional needs are whole people to be enjoyed far outweighs any inconvenience.
   - Parent #2: I have not visited the classroom during instructional time.
   - Parent #3: None.

6. What do you believe the impact of inclusion has been on your child?
   - Parent #1: Inclusion can only teach patience. I haven't seen any negative reactions.
   - Parent #2: He appreciates differences.
   - Parent #3: It has helped him to see that people are different and to understand a little better their differences.

7. What do you believe the impact of inclusion has been on other students in your child's class?

Parent #1: Same as above.
Parent #2: No reaction.
Parent #3: I believe it has been positive.

Parental Interview Data on Inclusion: Zavala Elementary School

Grade Level of Child:

Parent #1: PreK-1st
Parent #2: 2nd
Parent #3: 5th
Parent #4: 5th
Parent #5: 5th
Parent #6: 5th
Parent #7: 3 children/no grades indicated
Parent #8: no grade indicated
Family Friend #9: 5th

Note: Questionnaires were written in Spanish and English to facilitate communication. Two parents responded in Spanish.

1. What is your reaction to having students with special education needs in the grade level classes?

5 parents	Very positive
1 parent	Somewhat positive
2 parents	Neutral
1 parent	Somewhat negative

2. Have you observed changes in your child's attitudes toward students with special education needs?

Parent #1: Yes (no further indication)
Parent #2: None.
Parent #3: None.
Parent #4: None.
Parent #5: None. She doesn't have any problems with children of special education.
Parent #6: Yes
Parent #7: Yes
Parent #8: None.
Friend #9: None.

3. Where do you believe students with special education needs are best educated?

4 parents	in grade level classes with other students
	or
4 parents	in separate classes in the same school (1 favored mainstreaming)
1 parent	in separate schools

4. When your child's class became an inclusive classroom, what were your initial fears?

Parent #1: None.
Parent #2: None.
Parent #3: None.
Parent #4: None.
Parent #5: Not knowing if her grades would drop or if attitude would change.
Parent #6: None.
Parent #7: None.
Parent #8: None.

5. Have your fears changed?

Parent #1: None.

Parent #2: None.
Parent #3: None.
Parent #4: None.
Parent #5: Yes, there are no problems with the fears I had at first.
Parent #6: None.
Parent #7: None.
Parent #8: None.

6. What do you believe the impact of inclusion has been on your child?
   Parent #1: None.
   Parent #2: It has helped him a lot.
   Parent #3: None.
   Parent #4: None.
   Parent #5: A positive impact.
   Parent #6: Very good. Better attitude toward people with special needs.
   Parent #7: No change at all.
   Parent #8: None.

7. What do you believe the impact of inclusion has been on other students in your child's class?
   6 parents: No impact.
   Parent #6: Very good.
   Parent #7: Unknown.

APPENDIX H

Table 10.1: TAAS Data for Brentwood Elementary School Students, 1993-94 and 1997-98

Grades	Percentage of Students Passing (%)		Special Education Exempt (number)		Special Education Reading *		Special Education Math*		Special Education Writing*		General Education Reading*		General Education Math*		General Education Writing*	
	93-94	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*
Third	65	84	3	5	4/13	5/12	2/16	8/12			53/64	51/55	43/64	44/53		
Fourth	27	88	2	4	4/15	3/14	2/14	4/13	6/18	4/15	38/73	53/60	19/71	44/59	52/71	44/60
Fifth	51	84	8	4	0/8	1/6	0/9	3/6			60/80	58/64	41/82	58/63		

*The numerator reflects number of students passing; the denominator reflects number of students tested.

Table 10.2: TAAS Data for Dawson Elementary School Students, 1993-94 and 1997-98

Grades	Percentage of Students Passing (%)		Special Education Exempt (number)		Special Education Reading **		Special Education Math**		Special Education Writing**		General Education Reading**		General Education Math**		General Education Writing*	
	93-94	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*
Third	11	59	19	9	nd*/4	4/5	nd/3	3/8			26/44	32/43	7/45	32/46		
Fourth	43	67	13	11	1/8	1/7	0/6	4/8	nd/2	4/7	21/37	36/42	16/36	32/42	27/34	36/37
Fifth	27	58	9	10	nd/1	3/9	nd/1	4/10			27/48	32/41	13/49	31/41		

* nd = no data provided to protect confidentiality with small numbers of students.

**The numerator reflects number of students passing; the denominator reflects number of students tested.

77

73

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 10.3: TAAS Data for Pillow Elementary School Students, 1993-94 and 1997-98

Grades	Percentage of Students Passing (%)		Special Education Exempt (number)		Special Education Reading **		Special Education Math**		Special Education Writing**		General Education Reading**		General Education Math**		General Education Writing**	
	93-94	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*
Third	59	64	1	4	5/10	nd*/4	2/13	nd*/4			52/67	52/71	42/68	50/72		
Fourth	41	66	3	6	1/5	4/9	2/5	2/9	2/5	2/7	40/60	58/67	22/59	50/68	50/60	56/65
Fifth	52	78	5	15	3/8	1/7	1/8	1/7			38/52	62/69	29/49	55/69		

* nd = no data provided to protect confidentiality with small numbers of students.

**The numerator reflects number of students passing; the denominator reflects number of students tested.

Table 10.4: TAAS Data for Zavala Elementary School Students, 1993-94 and 1997-98

Grades	Percentage of Students Passing (%)		Special Education Exempt (number)		Special Education Reading **		Special Education Math**		Special Education Writing**		General Education Reading**		General Education Math**		General Education Writing**	
	93-94	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*	*93-94*	*97-98*
Third	60	57	6	14	0	nd*/2	0	nd*/2			26/30	24/30	20/30	18/30		
Fourth	32	67	14	8	0	nd*/2	0	nd*/2	0	nd*/2	21/32	35/42	17/35	30/40	23/33	32/36
Fifth	71	86	12	12	0	0	0	0			24/31	37/42	25/30	38/42		

* nd = no data provided to protect confidentiality with small numbers of students.

**The numerator reflects number of students passing; the denominator reflects number of students tested.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REFERENCE LIST

Baker, E.T., Wang, M.C., & Walberg, H.J. (December 1994/January 1995) The effects of inclusion on learning. Educational Leadership, 33-35.

Barnes, S.J., Sitton, M., & Kilgore, V.A. (1996). Case studies of successful campuses: Responses to a high stakes State accountability system (Statewide Educational Progress Study Report Number 2). Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.

Beckman, P.J., & Kohl, F.L. (1987). Interactions of preschoolers with and without disabilities in integrated and segregated settings: A longitudinal study. Mental Retardation, 25 (1), 5-11.

Buysse, V., & Bailey, D.B. (1993). Behavioral and developmental outcomes in young children with disabilities in integrated and segregated settings: A review of comparative studies. Journal of Special Education, 26 (4), 434-461.

Campbell, N. J., Dobson, J.E., & Bost, J.M. (1985). Educator perceptions of behavior problems of mainstreamed students. Exceptional Children, 51 (4), 298-303.

Cole, D. A., & Meyer, L. H. (1991). Social integration and severe disabilities: A longitudinal analysis of child outcomes. Journal of Special Education (25) (3), 340-351.

Cole, K.N., Mills, P.E., Dale, P.S., & Jenkins, J.R. (1991). Effects of preschool integration for children with disabilities. Exceptional Children, 58 (1), 36-45.

Giancreco, M.F., Dennis, R., Cloninger, C., Edelman, S., & Schattman, R. (1993). "I've Counted Jon": Transformational experiences of teachers educating students with disabilities. Exceptional Children, 59 (4), 359-372.

Gresham, F. M. (1982). Misguided mainstreaming: The case for social skills training with handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 48 (5), 422-433.

Gresham, F. M. (1983). Social skills assessment as a component of mainstreaming placement decisions. Exceptional Children, 49 (4), 331-336.

Hocutt, A.M. (1996). Effectiveness of special education: Is placement the critical factor? Special Education For Students With Disabilities, 6 (1), 77-102

Hunt, P., & Goetz, L. (1997). Research on inclusive educational programs, practices, and outcomes for students with severe disabilities. Journal of Special Education, 31 (1), 3-29.

Hunt, P., Farron-Davis, F., Beckstead, S., Curtis, D., & Goetz, L. (1994). Evaluating the effects of placement of students with severe disabilities in general education versus special classes. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 19 (3), 200-214.

Idol, L. (1993). Special Educator's Consultation Handbook: Second Edition. Austin, TX:

Idol, L. (1997). Creating collaborative and inclusive schools. Austin, TX: Eitel Press.

Individuals With Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq.

Jenkins, J.R., Heinen, A. (1989). Students' preferences for service delivery: Pull-out, in-class, or integrated. Exceptional Children, 55 (6), 516-523.

Madden, N.A., & Slavin, R.E. (1983). Mainstreaming students with mild disabilities: Academic and social outcomes. Review of Educational Research, 53 (4), 519-569.

Marston, D. (1996). A comparison of inclusion only, pull-out only, and combined service models for students with mild disabilities. The Journal of Special Education, 30 (2), 121-132.

McDonnell, J. (June, 1987) The integration of students with severe disabilities into regular public schools: An analysis of parent perceptions and potential outcomes. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 98-111.

National study of inclusive education. New York, NY: National Center on Educational Restructuring and Inclusion, The Graduate School and University Center, The City University of New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 375 606)

Parrish, T.B. (1995). Fiscal issues related to the inclusion of students with disabilities. Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 391 269) PRU-ED.

Reganick, K.A. (1993). Full inclusion: Analysis of a controversial issue. Nova University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 366 145)

Sharpe, M.N., York, J.L., & Knight, J. (1994). Effects of inclusion on the academic performance of classmates without disabilities: A preliminary study. Remedial and Special Education, 15 (5), 281-287.

The ERIC Review. (Fall 1996). Excerpts from policies and position statements on inclusive schools (Vol. 4, No. 3). Washington, DC: United States Department of Education, Educational Resources Information Center.

The Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS), The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997 (IDEA) General Information, Questions and Answers http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSERS/IDEA/q_and_a.html

The Office of Special Education, History of Special Education http://curry.edschool.Virginia.EDU/go/cise/ose/information/history.html

Vaughn, S., Elbaum, B.E., & Schumm, J.S. (1996). The effects of inclusion on the social functioning of students with learning disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 29 (6), 598-608.

Willrodt, K., Claybrook, S. (1995). Effects of inclusion on academic outcomes. Sam Houston State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 389 102)

Austin Independent School District

Department of Accountability
Susan Kemp, Ph.D., Interim Director

Office of Program Evaluation
Holly Williams, Ph.D., Assistant Director

Authors
Lorna Idol, Ph.D.
Julia Griffith

Editors
Holly Koehler, Ph.D.
Ralph Smith, M.Ed.
Karen Wendt-Keswick, M.A.

Board of Trustees
Kathy Rider, President
Doyle Valdez, Vice President
Ted Whatley, Secretary
Loretta Edelen
Olga Garza
Liz Hartman
Rudy Montoya
Ave Wahrmund
Patricia Whiteside

Superintendent of Schools
A.C. Gonzalez

Publication Number 97.22
December 1998